

WISCONSIN.

Henry J. Goddard to be postmaster at Chippewa Falls, Wis., in place of Henry J. Goddard. Incumbent's commission expires April 9, 1912.

Robert A. McDonald to be postmaster at Grand Rapids, Wis., in place of Robert A. McDonald. Incumbent's commission expired February 26, 1912.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 8, 1912.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

George M. Bourquin to be United States district judge, district of Montana.

CONSULS.

Julean H. Arnold to be consul at Chefoo, China.
Claude E. Guyant to be consul at Salina Cruz, Mexico.
Douglas Jenkins to be consul at Gottenborg, Sweden.
Alfred S. Northrup to be consul at Trebizond, Turkey.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Commander Chester M. Knepper to be a captain.
Commander Charles M. Fahs to be a captain.
Assistant Paymaster George P. Shamer to be a passed assistant paymaster.

Prof. Henry M. Paul to be a professor of mathematics, with the rank of captain.

Prof. Walter S. Harshman to be a professor of mathematics, with the rank of commander.

Ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade):

Carl T. Osburn,
William S. Farber,
Archibald D. Turnbull, and
William F. Cochrane, jr.

Passed Asst. Surg. John F. Murphy to be a surgeon.

POSTMASTERS.

ARIZONA.

Francis D. Crable, Tombstone.

CALIFORNIA.

Warren A. Woods, Suisun City.

GEORGIA.

John A. Crawford, Dalton.

ILLINOIS.

Fred Frazier, Viola.
Lizzie P. McKnight, Alexis.
Samuel S. Yolton, Villa Grove.

INDIANA.

Albert F. Shaw, Osgood.

KANSAS.

James H. Cleaver, Glasco.
Sheridan Crumrine, Longton.
Everett G. Gillidett, Plains.
Charles H. Kurtz, Mulberry.
Robert H. McBlain, Fort Riley.
George G. Nutter, Cuba.

MARYLAND.

Walter A. Aaronson, Aberdeen.

MICHIGAN.

Martin W. Coon, Ashley.
Fabius A. Fisk, Colon.
Frank McIntyre, Cheboygan.

MONTANA.

Louis V. Bogy, Chinook.
Bruce R. McNamer, Cut Bank.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Jesse C. Parker, Hillsboro.

NEW YORK.

Marc D. Johnson, Randolph.

OHIO.

John F. White, Logan.

OREGON.

Alfred F. Linegar, Coquille.
Virgil B. Staples, Vale.

WASHINGTON.

John F. Spangle, Cheney.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Emerson E. Deitz, Richwood.
Herbert P. Graham, Keystone.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, March 8, 1912.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, strengthen, we beseech Thee, our moral and spiritual fiber, that we may resist all the forms of temptation which assail us and with firm and steadfast reliance in Thee our God and our Father follow after the things which make for righteousness in the individual, in the home, in the State, the Nation, that we may exemplify in our daily life what we know to be right in Thy sight and in the sight of our fellow men, to the glory and honor of Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LEAVE TO WITHDRAW PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. J. M. C. SMITH, leave was granted to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Edward Cunningham (H. R. 10766), no adverse report having been made thereon.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE.

Mr. AMES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. AMES. On February 26, on page 2483 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it appears that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] made the following statement about me, which is to the detriment of my character and honesty, and affects my position as a Member of this body. I ask the Clerk to read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

I was amazed beyond my power to explain that that statement should have been made by the gentleman from Massachusetts. I can recall that a few months ago, when the gentleman from Massachusetts, when the cotton bill was under discussion, said that he did not own stock and was not interested in cotton mills, but that members of his family did own stock and were interested in them. The other day, when the Army appropriation bill was before the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. AMES] said that he did not own stock in ammunition concerns, but that members of his family did.

I want to raise the question now and have it settled once for all that not on the floor of this House, while I am a Member of it at least, will I have my integrity impugned by a man who stands here not as a Representative, but as a person representing members of his family who are stockholders in concerns that would receive dividends under contracts that might be awarded. I believe that Members on the floor of this House should represent an American constituency, a constituency of men, and not a constituency of family members demanding dividends earned on Government contracts.

Mr. AMES. Mr. Speaker, I regret the necessity that compels the following statements with reference to the gentleman from Iowa. To destroy his reputation for honesty and sincerity would not repair the injustice he has attempted to saddle upon me or right the wrong of his baseless accusations.

But to protect this membership from such attacks and to properly refute his accusations I feel in duty bound to show that one can not accept as facts these statements made by the gentleman from Iowa, whether they be made about others or about himself.

Mr. Speaker, in my remarks of the 26th of February, which formed the basis for the unwarranted attack upon me by the gentleman from Iowa, I did not impugn either his integrity or his motives.

In order to show how impossible it is for rational men to accept as fact these statements by the gentleman from Iowa, I desire to take his remarks concerning me, paragraph by paragraph, and analyze the same, to the end that those who hear or read may understand the curious results of the mental processes of the gentleman from Iowa.

On pages 2483 and 2484, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 26, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] began his misstatement of facts concerning myself and the so-called Ammunition Trust, which trust exists only in a neurotic imagination.

The first paragraph of his remarks concerning me reads as follows:

A few days ago, when the Army appropriation bill was before the House, I had something to say on the question of the Powder Trust. After I had taken my seat I was called out of the Chamber, and my attention was not called to some remarks made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. AMES] until they appeared in the RECORD. I was in hopes he would be here to-day, as I told him I expected to discuss this bill and to refer to his remarks. I was amazed when I came to read his remarks to find that not only the accuracy of my statements was questioned, but the good faith and sincerity with which I made them was also questioned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, can that paragraph convey any meaning to the normal mind other than that the gentleman from Iowa

intended us to believe that he was out of the room when I made my remarks concerning him and to which he took exception; and also that I questioned his good faith and sincerity in his absence?

And, in addition, does not his statement therein read to make us believe that his attention had not been called to my remarks until afterwards, when he read the RECORD?

But what are the facts in the case, Mr. Speaker? The facts that the gentleman from Iowa seems to have shunned.

The gentleman from Iowa was in the room, and not only in the room but listening to my remarks, and not only listening to my remarks but also interrupting them; and the proof of this fact lies in his interrupting me and asking that I yield, which I did. And his interrupting statement appears sandwiched into my remarks on page 2118 of the RECORD. And, furthermore, it was not until after I had used the major part of my first five minutes that the gentleman from Iowa left the Chamber, and only then in the face of my earnest verbal protest against his leaving. This protest of mine is shown in the eleventh line, second column, on that page.

And, further, after his departure I made no reference to the gentleman, except on the forty-ninth line, same page and column, where I expressed my doubt as to the information he had given us, as will be seen by reference to my remarks.

In addition, I challenge the gentleman from Iowa to verify his statement in the first paragraph that in my remarks—to which he took exception—I questioned either his good faith or his sincerity.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. AMES. Certainly.

Mr. GOOD. I will say that in the statement I made I did not disclaim hearing all of the gentleman's remarks. I stated that I did not hear all of his remarks. I was called from the Chamber immediately upon taking my seat by a newspaper reporter, and sat in the lobby for at least two or three minutes, and then told him he would have to excuse me. If the gentleman will look over my remarks carefully, he will note that I said I did not hear all his remarks. I at no time claimed that I did not hear some of the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. AMES. Mr. Speaker, I will read what the gentleman said in his remarks:

A few days ago, when the Army appropriation bill was before the House, I had something to say on the question of the Powder Trust. After I had taken my seat I was called out of the Chamber, and my attention was not called to some remarks made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. AMES] until they appeared in the RECORD. I was in hopes he would be here to-day, for I told him I expected to discuss this bill and to refer to his remarks. I was amazed, when I came to read his remarks, to find that not only the accuracy of my statements was questioned, but the good faith and sincerity with which I made them was also questioned.

Now, the facts in the case were that the gentleman from Iowa was in the room; and he was not only in the room listening to my remarks, and he was not only listening, but interrupted them, but after leaving the room, which he did against my verbal protest, I said nothing against the gentleman from Iowa except in one or two lines. And after the gentleman left the room there was nothing that could be construed as an attack on him, as anyone who will read the remarks will see.

And in addition, whether the gentleman was in the room or not, or whether he heard my remarks or not, or had his attention called to them or not, I challenge the gentleman from Iowa to verify his statement in the RECORD, and in the first paragraph of his remarks, that in my remarks to which he took exception I questioned either his good faith or his sincerity.

In his presence and to his face I called his speech a neurotic attack upon a perfectly defensible, honestly conducted industry—the manufacture of ammunition—and then explained later what I meant by neurotic.

For the benefit of the gentleman from Iowa I give, from Webster's Dictionary, the following definition of neurotic:

Neurotic: Acting on the nerves; useful in nervous disorders; of or pertaining to the nerves; seated in the nerves; of the nature of neurosis; affected with neurosis; subject to neuroses.

To recapitulate, then, on this one paragraph of the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa. There appear three separate and utterly misleading statements, evidently calculated to make us believe that the gentleman from Iowa was not in the Chamber when I made my remarks, that he was unaware of them until later, "when he read them in the RECORD," and that I had questioned his good faith and sincerity.

Had the gentleman from Iowa made the preceding misstatements in the heat of debate there might have been some excuse for him; but to go off to his office and, in the course of almost two weeks, reappear upon the floor—and in what ought to have been a carefully prepared speech—to make an un-

founded attack upon my standing as a Representative in an attempted justification of himself was not worthy his name or his State.

The second paragraph of the remarks of the Member from Iowa reads as follows:

I was amazed beyond my power to explain that that statement should have been made by the gentleman from Massachusetts. I can recall a few months ago, when the gentleman from Massachusetts, when the cotton bill was under discussion, said that he did not own stock and was not interested in cotton mills, but that members of his family did own stock and were interested in them. The other day, when the Army appropriation bill was before the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. AMES] said that he did not own stock in ammunition concerns, but that members of his family did.

Has it occurred to the gentleman from Iowa that there is scarcely a family of means in New England that some member thereof does not have some interest in some manufacture?

And I might have expected that the reasons for my declarations relative to the interests of members of my family would pass entirely over the head of the gentleman from Iowa.

I made those declarations to show not that I was likely therefore to have some knowledge of those subjects but to let the world know that because of my family connection, even if I held no interest of my own, I should therefore be considered as interested to some extent, and that any of my statements should be considered as those of one not wholly disinterested.

I had nothing to conceal, nothing of which to be ashamed, nothing to explain. And had I not made clear any possible connection of mine to such industries I might have left myself open to an accusation of concealment with an ulterior purpose by some loose-mouthed demagogic muckraker.

The next paragraph of the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa reads:

I want to raise the question now, and have it settled once for all, that not on the floor of this House, while I am a Member of it, at least, will I have my integrity impugned by a man who stands here not as a Representative but as a person representing members of his family, who are stockholders in concerns that would receive dividends under contracts that might be awarded. I believe that Members on the floor of this House should represent an American constituency, a constituency of men, and not a constituency of family members demanding dividends earned on Government contracts.

This paragraph is an honor to the fair-mindedness of the gentleman from Iowa, a high tribute to his sense of justice of right and wrong.

This paragraph epitomizes the attitude of mind of the gentleman from Iowa. Honest men are not prone to suspect dishonesty in their fellow-man. Honest men do not impugn the honesty of others unless the facts of dishonesty are self-evident, and then it could scarcely be considered an imputation. But herein has my honesty been impugned, and impugned under false pretenses.

Nowhere in my remarks did I impugn the honesty of the gentleman from Iowa; nowhere did I even question his sincerity or his good faith; but I am tempted to do so now. I realize that fact has no apparent place in the ratiocinations of the gentleman from Iowa, either in his statements about the Ammunition Trust or myself.

That the cotton mill in which members of my family are interested is situated in Georgia and has never done any business, to my knowledge, for the Government is of little moment in this controversy.

That the ammunition mill has to compete in the open market under sealed bids, and the awards are made to the lowest and best bidder, is not clearly brought out by the generous, fair-minded gentleman from Iowa. It would appear that he might properly be accused of having fallen into a misstatement of the facts in this paragraph, as he did in the first, and of making statements on a subject about which he had no information or knowledge.

The following paragraphs of the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa make no further accusations against my integrity, and while they are similarly full of false reasonings and misstatements of fact, I can not properly demonstrate the same under a question of personal privilege.

We can not afford to give any more credence to the statements and deductions of the gentleman from Iowa, in reference to the ammunition manufacturer, than we can to his statements and reasonings concerning himself or myself, and these have been proven on their own face to be inventions of an undesirable kind.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 18960, the agricultural appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the

state of the Union for the further consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is not this the day specially set apart for bills on the Private Calendar, and is not this the day that pension bills have preference?

The SPEAKER. Both propositions are true, and yet the motion of the gentleman from Virginia is in order. The House will understand that if his motion prevails private-bill day goes over.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would like to ask my friend from Virginia to withdraw his motion and let the pension bills be considered in their regular order.

Mr. LAMB. If I consented to that there is no telling when the agricultural bill will be completed. Very likely the discussion on these pension bills will run through the whole day. I want to say further that it is very necessary that we should get through with this agricultural bill expeditiously. We have before our committee various important measures which we can not consider while this bill is under consideration. We have the antioption bill, the oleomargarine bill, the LEVER agricultural extension bill, and various other measures. We sit from 10 to 12 o'clock every morning, and then come in here and work all the afternoon. The older men on the committee can not stand it as well as perhaps some of us younger ones.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Let me suggest to the gentleman that there is on the calendar the diplomatic bill, the Indian appropriation bill, the Post Office appropriation bill—

The SPEAKER. And the river and harbor bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And it is necessary that the public business be given preference at this time.

Mr. MANN. Let me suggest that there is plenty of time for getting these bills through. There will be no trouble about the passage of the appropriation bills.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And there is no trouble about the passage of the bills to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. MANN. This is the day for them, and they probably can be disposed of in a few minutes if we can consider them in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. RUSSELL. My information is that there will be no contest and no opposition to them. We have only one large bill.

Mr. LAMB. I think I have given good reasons why we ought to proceed with the consideration of our bill.

Mr. RUBBY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RUBBY. If the pension business goes over to-day, does it not go over for two weeks?

The SPEAKER. For two weeks, unless there is some special arrangement by the House.

Mr. MANN. And then, probably, some other bill will want to take their place two weeks from now.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, we insist that the pension bills be put upon their passage now—the day fixed by the rule.

The SPEAKER. Before the Chair puts the question, he desires to designate the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. JAMES, to preside as Speaker pro tempore to-morrow.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RODDENBERRY) there were 67 ayes and 91 noes.

So the motion was lost.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that there is no quorum present, and pending that I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman can not do both.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of no quorum and demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia demands the yeas and nays. Those in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Five Members have risen, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the other side.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, that is dilatory.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the other side.

The SPEAKER. Those opposed will rise and stand until counted. [After a pause.] Evidently not one-fifth of those present demand the yeas and nays, and the yeas and nays are refused.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and sixty-nine Members present, not a quorum.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia moves a call of the House.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, is not the call automatic?

The SPEAKER. It is automatic only when the House is dividing upon a question.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the House is dividing upon the question of whether we shall go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider the agricultural appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. No; that question has been disposed of. The House refused to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for that purpose. The question is on ordering a call of the House.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RODDENBERRY) there were—ayes 129, noes 5.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the vote be on the motion to go into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill?

The SPEAKER. That matter has been disposed of. The vote on this is simply a vote of present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Aiken, S. C.	Flood, Va.	Kopp	Powers
Anthony	Foss	Lafferty	Pujo
Ashbrook	Foster, Vt.	Langley	Randell, Tex.
Ayres	Fuller	Lenroot	Reilly
Barchfeld	Gardner, Mass.	Levy	Reyburn
Bates	Gillett	Lindsay	Richardson
Bingham	Goeke	McCreary	Roberts, Mass.
Bradley	Gudger	McDermott	Robinson
Buchanan	Guernsey	McGuire, Okla.	Rothermel
Burke, Pa.	Hanna	McHenry	Sabath
Cantrill	Harris	McKenzie	Saunders
Cary	Harrison, N. Y.	McKinley	Scully
Clark, Fla.	Haugen	Macon	Sheppard
Claypool	Hawley	Maher	Sherley
CConnell	Heald	Malby	Slemp
Copley	Heflin	Matthews	Smith, Cal.
Cox, Ind.	Henry, Tex.	Miller	Speer
Cravens	Hill	Moon, Pa.	Stack
Currier	Hobson	Moore, Pa.	Stephens, Nebr.
Curry	Howell	Mott	Taggart
Davenport	Howland	Oldfield	Taylor, Ohio
De Forest	Hubbard	Palmer	Townsend
Denver	Hughes, Ga.	Parran	Vreeland
Dickson, Miss.	Johnson, Ky.	Patten, N. Y.	Weeks
Draper	Johnson, S. C.	Pepper	Wilson, N. Y.
Farr	Kent	Peters	Young, Tex.
Fields	Kindred	Pou	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 285 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division on suspending further proceedings under the call.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 161, noes 7.

The SPEAKER. The ayes have it, and the Doorkeeper will open the doors.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Under the count just now by the Chair, is it in order to raise the point of no quorum?

The SPEAKER. It is not; the Chair would rule it dilatory. Further proceedings under the call are dispensed with, and the Doorkeeper will open the doors.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that pension bills in order to-day on the Private Calendar be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia asks unanimous consent that pension bills on the Private Calendar in order to-day be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman presenting the request how many of these pension bills there are?

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. There is only one from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and I understand one from the Committee on Pensions. They are omnibus bills and include, of course, a good many smaller bills.

Mr. RODDENBERY. Does the gentleman recall how many individual items there are?

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. There are 292 in the bill I am representing, and 9, as I understand, in the one from the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. RODDENBERY. Does not the gentleman think that we could facilitate action on these bills by permitting this bill carrying these items to go over until the next semimonthly or bimonthly pension day, so that both bills may be considered at one time and cover the entire subject?

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. I am very frank to say to the gentleman I do not know how it will expedite the bill by putting it over two weeks. I do not know what will be up then. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. RODDENBERY. I am endeavoring to say to the gentleman that from what consideration I have given to this particular bill it shows an absence of many of the egregious provisions that, in my judgment, obtained in the other bills, but on account of the pendency of the agricultural appropriation bill, in which I have been deeply and intensely interested, I have not yet had time to consider thoroughly all the cases, and I will state to the gentleman that so far as I have gone fewer objections occur in this bill than occurred, in my judgment, in the other bills.

It is no fault of the committee at this time, because this pending report and the bill came in due time; but because of having up the appropriation bill for the Agricultural Department I have not had time to go into it as fully and thoroughly and carefully as I would desire, and I am candidly of the opinion if the gentleman will not press the question at this time that two weeks from now we will make greater progress than we will make to-day, unless the powers that be avail themselves of radical procedure.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RUBEY. I think the gentleman ought to state his objections or ought not to be allowed to discuss the whole matter here.

The SPEAKER. It is all by unanimous consent.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. I will state to the gentleman from Georgia there is not an item in this bill but what has been gone over twice, once by the examiner detailed by the Interior Department to assist the committee and another time by the committee itself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RODDENBERY. Mr. Speaker, I must object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia objects.

PENSIONS.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider the bill H. R. 21230.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HAMILTON] moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House for the consideration of bills on the Private Calendar.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. RODDENBERY. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 169, noes 5.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. RODDENBERY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that motion is dilatory. [Applause.] It has not been more than five minutes since it was ascertained that there was a quorum, 284 Members being present.

Mr. RODDENBERY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RODDENBERY. Although five minutes have elapsed, and although a different motion on a different line of procedure has been before the House, the vote shows there is no quorum. Is not the raising of the point of no quorum in order?

The SPEAKER. The Chair holds that the point is dilatory. Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar for the consideration of the bill H. R. 21230, with Mr. Dixon of Indiana in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 21230) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HAMILTON] asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

Mr. RODDENBERY. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. RODDENBERY. I insist on addressing the Chair. I object. I addressed the Chair before any announcement was made.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of John W. Turner, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Eastman, late of Company H, Fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Mulligan, late of Company F, Seventh Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob Cooper, late of Company I, One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George L. Catlin, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph D. Lakin, late of Company B, One hundred and thirty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Julia E. Hall, widow of John B. Hall, late of Stokes's battery, Illinois Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Richard Hyam, late ordinary seaman on U. S. S. Ohio, Gem of the Sea, and North Carolina, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Madison Rolain, late of Company B, Eighth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John F. Rankin, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James D. Roberts, late adjutant Fifty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ward L. Roach, late of Company B, Second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward Kennedy, late landsman, U. S. S. Niagara, Oneida, and Princeton, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Moses Callison, late of Company B, Eighth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elisha Enox, late of Company K, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert H. Dollard, late of Company E, Eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph E. Cox, late of Company F, Second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph C. McGarrab, late of Company B, Sixty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Absalom P. Carlock, late of Company A, One hundred and sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Solomon Brobst, late of Company H, Seventh Regiment, and Company G, Fifth Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Deitrick, late of Company D, Forty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Clarkson Tryon, late of Company K, Eighty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Hartman, late of Company D, One hundred and seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Walsh, late of Company C, Fifty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Sutton, late of Company G, Sixty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nathan N. Spence, late of Company B, Eighty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Michael Moss, late of Company H, One hundredth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Johnson J. Miller, late of Company G, Sixty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lucien H. Young, late of Signal Corps, United States Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Michael A. Overdorff, late of Company L, Sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Silas H. Bradley, late of Company F, Twelfth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Mapel, late of Company F, Third Regiment, and Company I, Seventh Regiment, Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. R. Snyder, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Smith, late of Company C, Third Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Allen, late landsman on U. S. S. Ohio, Minnesota, and Wyalusing, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Moore, late of Company D, First Regiment Minnesota Mounted Volunteer Rangers, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Davidson, late of Company H, Seventeenth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James B. Robertson, late of Company D, Ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Bennett, late of Company F, Twenty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Stiff, late of Fifth Independent Battery Wisconsin Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William J. Helms, late of Company A, Twelfth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edwin A. Atwood, late of Company H, Eighty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harvey J. Davis, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lucretia J. Allen, former widow of John C. Gallegly, late of Company K, Seventy-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John W. Blackson, late of Company F, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward L. Bradley, late of Company G, Eleventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Orson Simonds, late of Tenth Independent Battery Wisconsin Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Meerdink, late of Company D, Thirty-fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sara J. Squier, widow of Whitman O. Squier, late of Company D, Twenty-fifth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William H. Herrick, late of Company B, One hundred and twenty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph A. Fones, late of Company C, Ninety-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Michael Kelly, late of Company B, Eleventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Davis, late of Company K, Fifteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Coleman R. Romine, late of Company K, Eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry J. Bess, late of Company E, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Mounted Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Abraham M. Heifner, late of Company I, Tenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ephraim Hommel, late of Company F, Fifty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Seymour Wheelock, late of Company I, Eighty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George C. Richards, late of Company K, Fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John R. Hurd, late lieutenant colonel, Second Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David H. Daywalt, late of Company A, Eighth Regiment, and Company B, Forty-ninth Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Foot, late of Company H, Second Regiment Colorado Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas J. Foote, late of Company G, Twentieth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James A. Gooch, late of Company A, Second Regiment Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Luther Stephenson, jr., late lieutenant colonel, Thirty-second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry C. McCain, late of Company I, One hundred and twentieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Cavins, late of Company K, Thirteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah A. Lovelady, widow of Thomas A. Lovelady, late of Company M, hospital steward, Sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Washington C. Shannon, late of Company K, Eleventh and Seventeenth Regiments Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him

a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sanford Glass, late of Company D, Eighth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry C. Zurner, late of Company F, Fifty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Company G, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Mounted Rifles, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Arthur Branagan, late of Company C, Ninety-sixth Regiment, and Company L, Ninety-fifth Regiment, Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Carson H. Kightlinger, late of Company G, Eighth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and Company I, Forty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charlie C. Bane, late of Company F, One hundred and thirty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob R. Zuck, late of Company B, Twenty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John S. McGinness, late assistant surgeon One hundred and ninety-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Dustin W. Whitney, late of Company G, One hundred and forty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Wibert, late of Company E, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Sharpshooters, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James M. Newland, late of Company H, Sixtieth Regiment, and Company I, Seventy-eighth Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William M. Capps, late principal musician, Third Regiment North Carolina Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of George W. Weekley, late of Companies M and O, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Curtice C. Whittier, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John J. Jackson, late of Company K, Tenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John F. Taylor, late of Company G, Fourteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William F. Holmes, late of Company F, Thirteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William D. Medley, late of Company K, Seventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andreas Wirth, late of Company A, Ninety-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin M. Laur, late of Company K, Forty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Spencer, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac E. Walker, helpless and dependent son of James H. Walker, late of Company A, Two hundred and third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Helen Kirschenmann, widow of Frederick Kirschenmann, late ship's corporal, U. S. S. Princeton, Mount Vernon, and Tacony, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John Nier, late of Company H, One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment Ohio National Guard Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Miller, late of Company B, Battalion of Engineers, United States Army, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Leroy S. Jones, late of Company B, One hundred and Eleventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert Phetteplace, late of Signal Corps, United States Army, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alfred Hosack, late of Companies G and H, First Regiment Mississippi Marine Brigade, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Adam Budell, late of Company H, Fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and Company A, Eighty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles J. Beach, late of Company H, Twentieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, Fourth Regiment United States Veteran Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Wollenberg, late of Company F, Third Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and Company H, Fourth Regiment New York Provisional Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James M. Arbuckle, late of Company K, One hundred and twentieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Margaret Nevison, former widow of Stephen D. Fuller, late of Company D, Eighteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and unassigned recruit Sixty-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Heman P. Manly, late of Company F, One hundred and eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William T. Patey, late coal heaver, U. S. S. Ohio and Malvern, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nathaniel Finly, late of Company F, Twenty-fourth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hezekiah Williams, late of Company L, First Regiment United States Cavalry, and Company B, Forty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Morrison, late of Company H, One hundred and sixteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Bridget Kelly, widow of John Kelly, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of George H. Sliter, late of Company H, Twenty-first Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and Companies B and M, Eleventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William J. Shotwell, late of Company E, First Regiment Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Edwards, late landsman of U. S. S. Vermont, Independence, and Macedonian, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Noah Hayes, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment, and Company B, One hundred and thirteenth Regiment, United States Colored Troops, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Allen, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac Thompson, late of Company K, Fifty-first Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Bachtler, late of Company D, Twelfth Regiment, New York State Militia Infantry, and Company B, One hundred and thirty-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John H. Lennon, late landsman, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Calvin M. West, late of Company F, First Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Zachary T. Russell, late of Company I, Fifty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Susan Howarth, widow of Abraham H. Howarth, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Vincent H. Gaskill, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jonathan Bigelow, late of Company K, Ninety-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Company H, Twenty-third Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elmer W. Welsheimer, late of Company G, Seventy-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Matthew F. Stuckey, late of Company K, One hundred and sixty-eighth Regiment Ohio National Guard Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John P. Wilson, late of Company C, One hundredth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Stander, late of Company D, First Regiment Missouri Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas L. Richardson, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Mounted Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Perry Walker, late of Company B, Fiftieth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James M. Chapel, late of Company A, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John D. Neff, late of Company B, Seventy-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward Church, late of Company B, Fiftieth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Caroline Holman, widow of Francis H. Holman, alias Frank H. Holman, late of Company I, Twenty-seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Emily C. Bruner, late of Company B, Eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Francis M. Herring, late of Company H, Fiftieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edwin Bloom, late of Company E, One hundred and seventy-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Dodwell, late of Battery I, First Regiment Illinois Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry B. Mitchell, late of Company B, Third Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Zebina M. Hunt, late of Company A, Eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Jessop, late of Company H, Seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Hanger, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Willis Lake, late of Company I, Thirty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David S. Pierce, late of Company I, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Urban, late of Company D, First Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Stonebraker, late of Company K, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Moneyhan, late of Company K, Thirty-sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John P. Brown, late of Company B, Thirty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Bold, late of Company H, Twenty-fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William A. Kerr, late of Company E, Second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Graves, late of Company I, Forty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel Hill, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William F. M. Lacey, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment, and Company K, Thirty-third Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary A. Wildason, widow of Esrom Wildason, late of Company G, Sixteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William J. Fraser, late of Company E, Fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alonzo P. Sharp, late of Company I, Twelfth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary C. Roos, widow of Everett J. Roos, late of Company E, Nineteenth Regiment New York State Militia Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John R. Taylor, late of Company A, Ninety-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Kirt, late of Company A, Ninth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Peter Giesman, late of Company F, Eleventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alice Bryant, helpless and dependent child of Charles Bryant, late of Company B, Twenty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Edward J. Harshman, late of Company G, Fifty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob W. Perry, late of Company D, Third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frederick Heise, late of Company E, Sixteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank Lafond, late of Company G, Seventeenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cornelius Cline, late of Company D, Twenty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel Rochester, late of Company I, Forty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Elmore, late of Company F, First Regiment Alabama and Tennessee Independent Vidette Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Elmer, late of Company I, Sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lewis B. Hunt, late of Company K, One hundred and sixtieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jane A. Walsh, widow of Robert Walsh, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary Etta Brewer, widow of Barret J. Brewer, late of Seventeenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John Schenrich, late of Companies F and D, Thirtieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Amos Graham, late of Company E, Sixty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Rachel Ann Keiffen, widow of Daniel R. Keiffen, late of Companies G and J, Seventy-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Moses E. Sturtevant, late of Company H, Third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alfred K. Young, late of Company G, Eighth Regiment, Company F, Fifty-second Regiment, and Company L, Seventeenth Regiment, Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Belle A. Corbin, widow of John A. Corbin, late of Company G, Ninety-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Ira Kennicutt, late of Company H, Eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William E. McLimans, late of Company C, Seventy-seventh and Forty-third Regiments Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William F. Marshall, late of Company I, Thirty-sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert Barfield, alias Albert Pound, late of Company C, Twenty-fourth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Peter Goergen, late of Company F, Ninety-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harrison H. Riddle, late of Company I, Fifty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elon S. Balcome, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hollis D. Kendall, late of Company I, Sixtieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Company G, Thirtieth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Riley Helms, late of Company F, Sixteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Company E, Fourteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David W. Clements, late of Company B, Sixtieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry C. Fairchild, late of Company I, Seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward B. North, late of Company G, Ninety-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James D. Burcham, late of Company E, Sixth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Jenkins, late of Company H, One hundred and twentieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Luvenia Walkinshaw, widow of Joseph C. Walkinshaw, late of Company I, Ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Joseph M. Horning, late of Company D, One hundred and forty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charlotte Atkinson, former widow of Thomas B. W. Francisco, late of Company H, Fifth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Sarah Knepley, widow of Edward C. Knepley, late of Company E, First Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jennie M. Metz, widow of Thomas J. Metz, late of Company B, One hundred and twenty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Samuel C. Rhoat, late of Company C, Ninety-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Warren Morrill, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Carter, jr., late of Company B, Tenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frederick Markgraf, late of Company F, Sixty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John G. Milliken, late of Company F, Ninety-eighth Regiment, and Company B, Seventy-fourth Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles A. Berry, late of Company E, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Viola Phillips, widow of John B. Phillips, late of Company C, One hundred and twenty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Isaac P. Hines, late of Company C, Forty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James McKelvey, late of Company K, Second Regiment, and Company E, Eighteenth Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Graham, widow of George Graham, late of Company B, Ninety-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Charles T. Garrard, late of Company H, Seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Stoker, late of Company H, Thirty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph A. Hanks, late of Companies A and E, Twenty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David Gilchrist, late of Company B, Thirty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nancy Gaven, former widow of Asa J. Moore, late of Company D, Sixteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Sharp Hagerty, late of Company B, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward A. Spaulding, late of Company K, Eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Mullen, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lemuel E. Sinsabaugh, late of Company H, Forty-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry C. Beebe, late of Company G, Veteran Battalion, First Regiment Colorado Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Grant Root, helpless and dependent child of Stephen M. Root, late of Company E, Twelfth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William H. Gilliland, late of Company I, Eighth Regiment, and Company K, Thirty-seventh Regiment, New York State Militia, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hollis M. Payson, late of Company I, Fifteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sumner P. Boies, late of Company F, Third Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Harvey Law, late of Company A, Twelfth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Luranah A. Ebert, widow of William C. Ebert, late of United States provost marshal's department, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John Andrews, late of Companies D and H, First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Noah Shidler, late of Company H, Thirteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Company D, Seventy-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert Carlile, late of Company D, Nineteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac E. Reed, late of Company G, One hundred and forty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Oliver P. Huffman, late of Company G, One hundred and sixty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William F. Emrick, late of Company G, Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel Weaver, late of Company G, Ninety-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas E. Enloe, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Richard Morrow, late of Company A, One hundred and eighty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cimon A. Wellman, late of Company A, Second Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martha M. Hildreth, widow of Samson A. Hildreth, late of Companies B, F, and K, Fourteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Belona B. Moran, widow of James T. Moran, late hospital steward, One hundred and sixteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Robert C. Guy, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William P. Dunlap, late of Company I, One hundred and third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward J. Davis, late of Companies D and E, One hundred and forty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Amelia D. Lewis, widow of Schuyler H. Lewis, late of Company H, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Martin, widow of George G. Martin, late lieutenant colonel First Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Charles W. Gibbs, late of Company F, Forty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Company E, Twenty-first Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel O. Lee, late landsman, U. S. S. Ohio, Vermont, and Potomac, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Howe, late of Company F, Fiftieth Regiment Massachusetts Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph W. Haynes, late of Company A, Seventeenth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Britton, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment United States Infantry, and Company D, One hundred and ninety-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cornelius Van Note, alias William Ridgway, late landman, U. S. S. Potomac, Penobscot, and Fearnot, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel H. Crider, late of Company E, Fifty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George E. Patterson, late of Company B, Eighth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Seymour Avery, late of Company L, First Regiment Vermont Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob E. Riley, late of Company H, Third Regiment Pennsylvania Provisional Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Susan J. Huff, widow of Eldred Huff, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Nehemiah W. Porter, late of Company A, Eleventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Pettys, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary De Krieger, widow of Peter W. De Krieger, late of Company C, Tenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John W. Ramsey, late of Company I, Two hundred and eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hugh Lappin, late of Company I, Seventieth Regiment, and Company D, Seventy-third Regiment, New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John M. Oldham, late of Company C, Forty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Sixty-sixth Company, Second Battalion, Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Julia A. Rulo, widow of John Rulo, late of Company D, Thirtieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jerome B. Evans, late of Company D, Sixty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James M. Bishop, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David C. Chadwick, late of Company F, Twenty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jabez G. Cole, late of Company I, Fifty-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel S. Hall, late of Company H, Sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Della M. Williams, widow of David T. Williams, late of Company A, Seventh-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Daniel Williams, late of Company E, Sixty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward G. Handley, late of Company I, One hundred and twenty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jefferson Jackson, helpless and dependent child of Elijah Jackson, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Charles Herriman, late of Company E, Ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Strong, late of Company G, Third Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Silas Russell, late of Company G, Sixteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles A. Reed, late assistant surgeon Ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alonzo T. Hickey, late of Company D, Seventy-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Stauffer, late of Company G, Sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Godfrey K. Biber, late of Company D, One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martin V. Curry, late of Company G, First Regiment United States Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Anthony Lowman, late of Company B, Sixty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaiah J. Moore, late of Company B, Sixty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry McKenna, late second-class fireman, United States ships North Carolina, Susquehanna, and Vermont, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Christopher T. Pearce, late of Companies G, C, and B, Fifth Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles L. Burgess, late of Company D, Twenty-third Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel M. Zartman, late of Company K, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Catherine Karcher, widow of Frederick J. Karcher, late of Company A, Third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of James Buckley, late of Independent Battery G, Pennsylvania Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John H. Baty, late of Company I, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and Independent Battery Pennsylvania Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Fitzgerald, late of Company H, Sixth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Hockenbery, late of Company I, Fifty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Smith, late of Company G, Twenty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry C. Farmer, late of Company E, Forty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henderson Scott, late of Company E, Thirty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Carey, late of Company H, One hundred and ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Margaret C. Malone, widow of Robert Malone, late of Company D, One hundred and ninety-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of James T. Singleton, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew Smith, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James E. Greene, late of Company A, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lewis H. Walker, late of Company G, Forty-third Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George E. Wilson, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The foregoing bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to said committee:

H. R. 179. John W. Turner.	H. R. 5579. John R. Hurd.
H. R. 240. John Eastman.	H. R. 5580. David H. Daywalt.
H. R. 241. John Mulligan.	H. R. 5581. John W. Foot.
H. R. 272. Jacob Cooper.	H. R. 5583. Thomas J. Foote.
H. R. 279. George L. Catlin.	H. R. 5584. James A. Gooch.
H. R. 669. Joseph D. Lakin.	H. R. 5728. Luther Stephenson, jr.
H. R. 670. Julia E. Hall.	H. R. 5797. Henry L. McCain.
H. R. 695. Richard Hyam.	H. R. 5834. William Cavins.
H. R. 1000. James Madison Rolain.	H. R. 5837. Sarah A. Lovelady.
H. R. 1015. John F. Rankin.	H. R. 5843. Washington C. Shannon.
H. R. 1138. James D. Roberts.	H. R. 6009. Sanford Glass.
H. R. 1350. Ward L. Roach.	H. R. 6152. Henry C. Zurner.
H. R. 1546. Edward Kennedy.	H. R. 6239. Arthur Branagan.
H. R. 1784. Moses Callison.	H. R. 6276. Carson H. Kightlinger.
H. R. 1799. Elisha Enox.	H. R. 6289. Charlie C. Bane.
H. R. 1924. Robert H. Dollarhide.	H. R. 6467. Jacob R. Zuck.
H. R. 1925. Joseph E. Cox.	H. R. 6571. John S. McGinness.
H. R. 2021. Joseph C. McGarrath.	H. R. 6581. Dustin W. Whitney.
H. R. 2143. Absalom P. Carlock.	H. R. 6933. Charles W. Wibert.
H. R. 2157. Solomon Brobst.	H. R. 6942. James M. Newland.
H. R. 2304. Charles Deitrick.	H. R. 6980. William M. Capps.
H. R. 2334. Clarkson Tryon.	H. R. 7144. George W. Weekley.
H. R. 2360. Charles Hartman.	H. R. 7215. Curtice C. Whittier.
H. R. 2512. John Walsh.	H. R. 7445. John J. Jackson.
H. R. 2550. William Sutton.	H. R. 7448. John F. Taylor.
H. R. 2618. Nathan N. Spence.	H. R. 7580. William F. Holmes.
H. R. 2622. Michael Moss.	H. R. 7643. William D. Medley.
H. R. 2641. Johnson J. Miller.	H. R. 7744. Andreas Wirth.
H. R. 2642. Lucien H. Young.	H. R. 7746. Benjamin M. Laur.
H. R. 2643. Michael A. Overdorff.	H. R. 7792. Henry Spencer.
H. R. 2843. Silas H. Bradley.	H. R. 7854. Isaac E. Walker.
H. R. 3038. William Mapel.	H. R. 8052. Helen Kirschenmann.
H. R. 3276. William H. R. Snyder.	H. R. 8125. John Nier.
H. R. 3325. John Smith.	H. R. 8280. Joseph Miller.
H. R. 3468. James Allen.	H. R. 8367. Leroy S. Jones.
H. R. 3671. John W. Moore.	H. R. 8597. Albert Phetteplace.
H. R. 3717. Thomas Davidson.	H. R. 8717. Alfred Hosack.
H. R. 3811. James B. Robertson.	H. R. 9084. Adam Budell.
H. R. 4082. Joseph Bennett.	H. R. 9057. Charles J. Beach.
H. R. 4117. John W. Stiff.	H. R. 9309. William Wollenberg.
H. R. 4302. William J. Helms.	H. R. 9352. James M. Arbuckle.
H. R. 4380. Edwin A. Atwood.	H. R. 9596. Margaret Nevison.
H. R. 4394. Harvey J. Davis.	H. R. 9598. Heman P. Manly.
H. R. 4395. Lucretia J. Allen.	H. R. 9612. William T. Patey.
H. R. 4474. John W. Blackson.	H. R. 9708. Nathaniel Finly.
H. R. 4516. Edward L. Bradley.	H. R. 9712. Hezekiah Williams.
H. R. 4532. Orson Simonds.	H. R. 9726. George Morrison.
H. R. 4590. Henry Meerdink.	H. R. 9763. Bridget Kelly.
H. R. 4633. Sara J. Squier.	H. R. 9822. George H. Sliter.
H. R. 4636. William H. Herrick.	H. R. 9943. William J. Shotwell.
H. R. 4837. Joseph A. Fones.	H. R. 10481. Charles Edwards.
H. R. 4891. Michael Kelly.	H. R. 10714. Noah Hayes.
H. R. 5124. William H. Davis.	H. R. 10751. John Allen.
H. R. 5184. Coleman R. Romaine.	H. R. 10870. Isaac Thompson.
H. R. 5234. Henry J. Bess.	H. R. 10974. John Bachtler.
H. R. 5353. Abraham M. Heifner.	H. R. 11088. John H. Lennon.
H. R. 5384. Ephraim Hommel.	H. R. 11140. Calvin M. West.
H. R. 5575. Seymour Wheelock.	H. R. 11153. Zachary T. Russell.
H. R. 5576. George C. Richards.	H. R. 11283. Susan Howarth.

H. R. 11287. Vincent H. Gaskill.
 H. R. 11288. Jonathan Bigelow.
 H. R. 11289. Elmer W. Welsheimer.
 H. R. 11291. Matthew F. Stuckey.
 H. R. 11348. John P. Wilson.
 H. R. 11526. John Stander.
 H. R. 11562. Thomas L. Ritchard-son.
 H. R. 11629. Perry Walker.
 H. R. 11740. James M. Chapel.
 H. R. 11939. John D. Neff.
 H. R. 12049. Edward Church.
 H. R. 12068. Caroline Holman.
 H. R. 12069. Emily C. Bruner.
 H. R. 12143. Francis M. Herring.
 H. R. 12183. Edwin Bloom.
 H. R. 12186. James Dodwell.
 H. R. 12378. Henry B. Mitchell.
 H. R. 12501. Zebina M. Hunt.
 H. R. 12540. William Jessop.
 H. R. 12563. William Hanger.
 H. R. 12598. Willis Lake.
 H. R. 12666. David S. Pierce.
 H. R. 12677. John W. Urban.
 H. R. 12706. John W. Stonebraker.
 H. R. 12726. James Moneyhan.
 H. R. 12791. John P. Brown.
 H. R. 12953. William Bold.
 H. R. 13023. William A. Kerr.
 H. R. 13069. John Graves.
 H. R. 13071. Samuel Hill.
 H. R. 13076. William F. M. Lacey.
 H. R. 13121. Mary A. Wildason.
 H. R. 13347. William J. Fraser.
 H. R. 13430. Alonzo P. Sharp.
 H. R. 13751. Mary C. Roos.
 H. R. 13762. John R. Taylor.
 H. R. 13818. William Kirt.
 H. R. 13819. Peter Giesman.
 H. R. 13832. Alice Bryant.
 H. R. 13851. Edward J. Harshman.
 H. R. 13857. Jacob W. Perry.
 H. R. 13916. Frederick Heise.
 H. R. 13921. Frank Lafond.
 H. R. 13963. Cornelius Cline.
 H. R. 13980. Samuel Rochester.
 H. R. 14023. William H. Elmore.
 H. R. 14147. George Elmer.
 H. R. 14148. Lewis B. Hunt.
 H. R. 14150. Jane A. Walsh.
 H. R. 14153. Mary Etta Brewer.
 H. R. 14208. John Scheurich.
 H. R. 14294. Amos Graham.
 H. R. 14337. Rachel Ann Keifflein.
 H. R. 14395. Moses E. Sturtevant.
 H. R. 14426. Alfred K. Young.
 H. R. 14522. Belle A. Corbin.
 H. R. 14536. Ira Kennicutt.
 H. R. 14569. William E. McLimans.
 H. R. 14570. William F. Marshall.
 H. R. 14604. Albert Barfield, alias Albert Pound.
 H. R. 14609. Peter Goergen.
 H. R. 14732. Harrison H. Riddle.
 H. R. 14798. Elton S. Balcome.
 H. R. 14799. Hollis D. Kendall.
 H. R. 14801. William Riley Helms.
 H. R. 14802. David W. Clements.
 H. R. 14803. Henry C. Fairchild.
 H. R. 14985. Edward B. North.
 H. R. 15152. James D. Burcham.
 H. R. 15198. James Jenkins.
 H. R. 15275. Luvenia Walkinshaw.
 H. R. 15283. Joseph M. Horning.
 H. R. 15437. Charlotte Atkinson.
 H. R. 15439. Sarah Knepley.
 H. R. 15513. Jennie M. Metz.
 H. R. 15538. Samuel C. Rhoat.
 H. R. 15821. Warren Morrill.
 H. R. 15823. Joseph Carter jr.
 H. R. 15881. Frederick Markgraff.
 H. R. 15953. John G. Milliken.
 H. R. 16162. Charles A. Berry.
 H. R. 16368. Viola Phillips.
 H. R. 16371. Isaac P. Hines.
 H. R. 16372. James McKelvey.
 H. R. 16376. Elizabeth Graham.
 H. R. 16379. Charles T. Garrard.
 H. R. 16406. John W. Stoker.
 H. R. 16502. Joseph A. Hanks.
 H. R. 16515. David Gilchrist.
 H. R. 16528. Nancy Gaven.
 H. R. 16541. Sharp Hagerty.
 H. R. 16543. Edward A. Spaulding.
 H. R. 16545. Charles Mullen.
 H. R. 16707. Lemuel E. Sinsabaugh.
 H. R. 16724. Henry C. Beebe.
 H. R. 16798. Grant Root.
 H. R. 16858. William H. Gilliland.
 H. R. 16917. Hollis M. Payson.
 H. R. 16924. Sumner P. Boies.
 H. R. 16964. Harvey Law.
 H. R. 17055. Luranah A. Ebert.
 H. R. 17091. John Andrews.
 H. R. 17342. Noah Shidler.
 H. R. 17344. Albert Carlile.
 H. R. 17385. Isaac E. Reed.
 H. R. 17652. Oliver P. Huffman.
 H. R. 17656. William F. Emrick.
 H. R. 17657. Daniel Weaver.
 H. R. 17693. Thomas E. Enloe.
 H. R. 17718. Richard Morrow.
 H. R. 17729. Cimon A. Wellman.
 H. R. 17730. Martha M. Hildreth.
 H. R. 17777. Belona B. Moran.
 H. R. 17851. Robert C. Guy.
 H. R. 17874. William P. Dunlap.
 H. R. 17882. Edward J. Davis.
 H. R. 17904. Amelia D. Lewis.
 H. R. 17945. Mary E. Martin.
 H. R. 17949. Charles W. Gibbs.
 H. R. 18087. Samuel O. Lee.
 H. R. 18088. James Howe.
 H. R. 18089. Joseph W. Haynes.
 H. R. 18095. Charles Britton.
 H. R. 18126. Cornelius Van Note, alias William Ridge-way.
 H. R. 18172. Daniel H. Crider.
 H. R. 18176. George E. Patterson.
 H. R. 18178. Seymour Avery.
 H. R. 18187. Jacob E. Riley.
 H. R. 18192. Susan J. Huff.
 H. R. 18193. Nehemiah W. Porter.
 H. R. 18398. Charles Pettys.
 H. R. 18408. Mary De Kreiger.
 H. R. 18465. John W. Ramsey.
 H. R. 18468. Hugh Lappin.
 H. R. 18474. John M. Oldham.
 H. R. 18512. Julia A. Rulo.
 H. R. 18517. Jerome B. Evans.
 H. R. 18520. James M. Bishop.
 H. R. 18574. David C. Chadwick.
 H. R. 18610. Jabez G. Cole.
 H. R. 18663. Samuel S. Hall.
 H. R. 18667. Della M. Williams.
 H. R. 18700. Daniel Williams.
 H. R. 18744. Edward G. Handley.
 H. R. 18753. Jefferson Jackson.
 H. R. 18816. Charles Herriman.
 H. R. 18879. George W. Strong.
 H. R. 18896. Silas Rossell.
 H. R. 19016. Charles A. Reed.
 H. R. 19109. Alonzo T. Hickey.
 H. R. 19110. William H. Stauffer.
 H. R. 19112. Godfrey K. Biber.
 H. R. 19199. Martin V. Curry.
 H. R. 19251. Anthony Lowman.
 H. R. 19352. Isaiah J. Moore.
 H. R. 19466. Henry McKenna.
 H. R. 19501. Christopher T. Pearce.
 H. R. 19520. Charles L. Burgess.
 H. R. 19534. Samuel M. Zartman.
 H. R. 19597. Catherine Karcher.
 H. R. 19610. James Buckley.
 H. R. 19611. John H. Baty.
 H. R. 19613. Charles Fitzgerald.
 H. R. 19614. John Hockenbery.
 H. R. 19622. John W. Smith.
 H. R. 19668. Henry C. Farmer.
 H. R. 19676. Henderson Scott.
 H. R. 19744. William Carey.
 H. R. 19747. Margaret C. Malone.
 H. R. 19942. James T. Singleton.
 H. R. 20037. Andrew Smith.
 H. R. 20089. James E. Greene.
 H. R. 20176. Lewis H. Walker.
 H. R. 20913. George E. Wilson.

During the reading,

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is a quorum of the committee present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and four Members are present—a quorum—and the Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk proceeded, and concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this omnibus bill, including 17 original pensions and 275—

Mr. RODDENBERRY. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Is not now, at the conclusion of the reading of the bill, the first time parliamentarily appropriate to ask unanimous consent that the report of the committee on the bill be read?

Mr. RUSSELL. We object to the reading of the report.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman in charge of the bill [Mr. HAMILTON] is entitled to recognition.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. A further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. May I appropriately obtain information at this time whether I shall be permitted to be recognized by the Chair for the purpose of general debate on this bill, for which purpose I desire to be recognized?

The CHAIRMAN. General debate is in order at this time, but the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HAMILTON] has the floor. When he concludes, if the gentleman is recognized—

Mr. RODDENBERRY. I desire to state to the Chair at this time that I wish to be recognized in order.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. What time does the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RODDENBERRY] want?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. The time allowed by the existing rules—one hour.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. An hour covers all the debate.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Not according to the rule, as I understand it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HAMILTON] has the floor.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, as I stated, this bill covers 292 cases. Seventeen of them are original pensions granted by the committee, and consist of allowances made to widows and, perhaps in one or two cases, to children. The total amount carried by this bill—

Mr. BARTLETT. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. Yes, sir.

Mr. BARTLETT. I understood the gentleman to say that 17 of them are increases of pensions which have heretofore been granted by Congress?

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. No, sir. Seventeen of them are original pensions to widows, granted the first time.

Mr. BARTLETT. In this bill?

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. Yes, sir. They are principally granted to widows.

Mr. BARTLETT. The reason I asked the question was that I knew it was the rule of the committee, and has been for many years, both in the House and the Senate, with rare exceptions, that you do not increase the pension when the pensioner's right to draw a pension is by special act.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. It depends on the statute.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thought the gentleman said that 17 of these were increases.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. No, sir.

Mr. BARTLETT. I misunderstood the gentleman.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. There are increases, but not necessarily increases over pensions granted by special acts.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am interested in the matter, because I have given that as an answer to persons in my district who desired to have bills introduced.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. The committee has a rule—rule No. 2—by which only in very exceptional cases they will increase pensions granted by Congress under special act.

Mr. BARTLETT. This committee is enforcing that rule in this House?

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. Yes; the best we can. I do not know that there are any cases in this bill that would violate that rule.

Mr. BARTLETT. I simply wanted to know for my own information, because I have had correspondence on the subject with residents in my district, and in a few cases have had inquiries as to pensions under the invalid-pension law and applications for pensions for soldiers of the Spanish-American War where Congress has granted a pension by special legislative act. Then in such cases the committee does not increase that pension?

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. That is the rule of the committee, but in candor I will say to the gentleman that it is not entirely inflexible. I recall to mind one or two cases in which that rule has not been followed.

Mr. BARTLETT. I think it is a rare exception, but I have known some cases since I have been here. I have known one or two cases where Congress has increased the pension of the pensioner who was pensioned by special act of Congress. The reason why I made the inquiry was that I understood the gentleman to say that there were 17 cases of that kind in this bill.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. No, sir; I did not mean to say that.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, the rule of the Committee on Invalid Pensions provides that in no instance will a pension be increased where the original pension was granted by special

act of Congress. I wish to say to the gentleman in charge of the bill that if you are going to depart from that practice you ought to modify your rule. I have answered scores of letters, which I have received in cases where parties have applied for increases under those circumstances, calling attention to this rule, and up to this moment I did not understand that it had been violated.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. In a few cases only, but not in this bill.

Mr. ADAIR. There are no cases of that kind in this bill?

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. No; I think not.

Mr. ALEXANDER. You ought to live up to the rule.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HAMILTON] answer the question he started to answer. I am interested in this matter.

Mr. ADAIR. I want to say, in answer to what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ALEXANDER] has said, which in a way reflects upon the committee of the House, that so far as the Committee on Invalid Pensions of the House is concerned it does not now and never did have a rule of that kind. The rule making such a distinction was adopted by the Senate Committee on Pensions, but I am informed by some of the older Members in the House—and I believe the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SULLOWAY] will bear me out in that statement—that the House committee has no such rule.

Mr. ALEXANDER. You mean you have no rule at all?

Mr. ADAIR. No written rules; and have not had.

Mr. ALEXANDER. These are the rules we understand that the committee has, and when we write for information to the committee those are the rules we get.

Mr. ADAIR. Does the gentleman refer to the Senate rules?

Mr. ALEXANDER. No; to the rules of the House Committee on Invalid Pensions, when we ask for the rules of the committee. This is the first time I ever knew that that was not so.

Mr. ADAIR. They are not the rules of the House committee. We turned over to the gentleman all the rules that we have in our possession.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the gentleman allow me another question?

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. Yes, sir.

Mr. BARTLETT. I did not raise this question idly, Mr. Chairman. I have three cases that I recall now where I have introduced bills, and I have been informed by the Committees on Invalid Pensions and on Pensions of the House and the Committee on Pensions of the Senate—and I want to say not by any particular member of the Committee on Invalid Pensions—but it is the general understanding that where a special bill has passed, granting a pension and fixing the amount, it is not increased in these bills coming from this committee except in very rare instances, with rare exceptions. That, as I understand, is the history of it for years in this House. It has been the practice of the committees of both Houses, both the House and the Senate, not to increase a pension when the pension had its origin in a special legislative act. I have acted upon that. I had one case here some years ago in which I secured a pension for a Federal soldier who lived in my district, in which case that rule was not adhered to, as my friend from New Hampshire [Mr. SULLOWAY] will recall. It was a very worthy case, and the gentleman from New Hampshire aided me materially in securing the increase for the old man, who was recognized as being entitled to the increase, but because of the fact that the original pension had been granted by Congress, they did not want to increase it. The old man was at that time helpless, and the Senate committee did make an exception to the rule in that case, informing me, however, that they would not do so again.

I have very few applicants for pensions in my district. Most of those who apply are veterans of the Spanish-American War and the Indian wars, but I have secured pensions for some who were in the Federal Army during the War between the States. I use the expression that the President prefers. I have uniformly told them that their pensions could not be increased, because of this rule of both the House and Senate that a pension not granted through the Pension Bureau, but originating by legislative enactment, could not be increased.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I have sent them notice to that same effect.

Mr. BARTLETT. If the committee is going to make any more exceptions, I have one or two cases that should be granted.

Mr. KENDALL. It has been the popular understanding here in the House, I think, that the rules of the Pension Committee exclude from further relief a soldier who is in receipt of a pension under a private act. That is not, however, a fixed rule of the committee. While it is a regulation which has been recognized more or less, it ought to be relaxed. If a soldier is pensioned at \$24 a month under an act of Congress, and subsequent

to that time he becomes totally paralyzed and requires constant attention, he should be given additional aid.

Mr. BARTLETT. I have that identical case in mind.

Mr. KENDALL. I am describing the gentleman's case.

Mr. BARTLETT. Then there is no reason why this rule should be enforced. The soldier ought to be entitled to additional benefits commensurate with his condition. I agree with the gentleman. Can the gentleman answer this question, Whether the Bureau of Pensions has authority to increase the pension of a pensioner who draws his pension by reason of a private act?

Mr. KENDALL. Not at all, unless his disabilities growing out of his service are considered.

Mr. BARTLETT. I understand the presumption is that when you pension a man by legislative act he can not get a pension at the Pension Bureau under the general law.

Mr. KENDALL. That is a mistake. If he wants to resort to the general law and can establish that he is entitled to more pension than Congress has allowed him, he has a right to do it.

Mr. BARTLETT. He must be refused at the Pension Office before we can consider his bill.

Mr. KENDALL. Other circumstances may arise—

Mr. RUSSELL. I think I can explain in just a word about what the action of the committee has been and the reason for its action. As stated by the gentleman from Indiana, as I understand, the Senate has written rules. We have not written rules. We have unwritten rules that have guided us. Bills passed by the House must also be passed by the Senate. The House committee thought it was practically useless for us to give the second increase where a man had previously one special bill, because the Senate would turn it down anyway, and has been doing it.

I understand the action of the committee on these cases has been about this: Notwithstanding the Senate rule and our unwritten rule, where a man has been granted an increase by special act, but since that time his disabilities have become greater, we felt, and I think the committee feels, and the House feels, that it would be unjust to deny him the right he is justly entitled to. But if there has been no increase in the disabilities since the private act was granted, the committee has not felt that it ought to undo the work done by the previous committee and the previous Congress by recommending an increase.

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of correcting the impression regarding the granting of second special bills and as to the unwritten rule referred to by the gentleman from Missouri, I think you will find by referring to the printed rules of the committee that rule 2 applies.

Mr. KENDALL. Will the gentleman from West Virginia yield?

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KENDALL. I want to say that this argument is entirely unnecessary, because there are no such items in this bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. I understood that there were.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. I do not remember of any that are in this bill; there may be one or two.

Mr. BARTLETT. Then the gentleman from Iowa is mistaken.

Mr. KENDALL. I am making* the statement on the authority of some members of the committee on whose judgment I rely.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. I say that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] is entitled to a candid answer on this matter.

Mr. BARTLETT. And I know I will get it.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. I have known one or two cases where the statutory pension has been increased. I think there is a printed rule of our committee on a card which has the rule 2 which the gentleman from Ohio speaks of, but I never was present at any meeting when it was adopted.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am not making any complaint. As I stated to the gentleman, my pension cases are very few; but when the committee have sent to Members of the House printed rules which govern them in the reporting of bills, and we have informed our constituents who desire pensions that they would not be accepted, we want to know whether the committee intends to stand by the rule.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. The Committee on Pensions, of which I am not a member, has an inflexible rule of that kind, and there is where the most of the cases to which you refer come from.

Mr. BARTLETT. I have had one bill before the Committee on Invalid Pensions that ran up against this rule.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. While that rule is printed on the card, I know it is not an inflexible rule.

Mr. FOWLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. FOWLER. I desire to know if the Committee on Invalid Pensions does not have a set of rules in book form, and if rule No. 2 does not declare in substance that where a soldier has been pensioned by a private act under no circumstances will the committee consider an application for an additional private act.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. I think the gentleman is right about that. I think there is such a rule printed on a card, but I never was present at a meeting when the rule was adopted, and I think I have been present at every meeting while I have been in the city.

Mr. FOWLER. Does the gentleman understand that the rule was adopted and intended to be universal and to prevent Members of Congress from encouraging those who are drawing pensions by private act from making application for a second private act?

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. As I stated a while ago, I do not think the rule ever was adopted. How it got into print that way I do not know. It may have been adopted by some prior Congress.

Mr. FOWLER. I should be glad to have some gentleman inform me how it became a rule, because I have written a number of old soldiers in my district, sent them copies of that rule, and called their attention to it. Now, if that is not the rule of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, I desire to correct myself with some of these old soldiers in my district who are entitled to more pension than they are now receiving.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. All I can say is that, if it is a rule of the committee, I have known it to be violated in two or three cases.

Mr. SIMS. It has been the rule for many years.

Mr. FOWLER. One more question. I will ask the gentleman how long this rule No. 2, governing the Committee on Invalid Pensions, has been in vogue?

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. I can not answer that, because, as I say, I have never been present at any meeting when that rule was adopted. I have been present frequently when it was acted on.

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio. Referring to the controversy regarding the rule granting a second special pension to the same soldier, it may be that the House Committee on Invalid Pensions has not adopted a rule, but it has been printed as a rule, and I hold it in my hand. On the first page of this pamphlet is printed "Committee on Invalid Pensions, House of Representatives." It may have been handed down in days gone by, but it does read "Rules of House of Representatives."

And on page 4 of Committee Rules, line 1 reads:

The Pension Committees of the two Houses of Congress were created to consider a very few claims, etc.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Yes; it was the Pension Committees of the two Houses, and neither of those committees is an invalid pension committee.

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio. It is misleading, and when a soldier writes me for a second special pension I refer him to rule 2.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Well, that furnishes a nice buffer for the gentleman.

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio. Oh, I am not in need of any buffer, I assure the gentleman. The old soldier of my district knows I will use every honorable means to help him.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to have rule No. 2 read into the RECORD, so that soldiers may understand.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from West Virginia yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have only a few words to say in reference to this bill. I do not know that it is necessary to say anything. I have already stated in the House this morning that there is no item included in this bill that has not had a thorough examination. In fact, it has been examined more than once. In the first place—and I say this for the Members of the House generally, because I have had quite a number of inquiries about it—the Interior Department, under a statute, details to the Committee on Invalid Pensions an officer, who is known as an examiner. As prerequisite to taking up any case in that committee it has to be passed upon by that examiner. I do not mean to say by that that the examiner is final upon it, but in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred I believe I would be safe in saying that no pension has ever been granted except upon the recommendation of the examiner.

Sometimes the examiner reports the case as doubtful. In that case it is then considered by a subcommittee and then by

the full committee. I do not recall any case in which the examiner has made an adverse report where the claim has been allowed by the committee, although I make that as a general statement, and I may be mistaken in regard to it. I think this bill ought to pass.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question about one particular claim in this bill which I have seen, and the only one to which I desire to interpose any specific objection. Probably the gentleman can explain it. It is to be found on page 38 in the report, being H. R. 6980, the case of William M. Capps. I read from the report:

William M. Capps, aged 70 years, served as a principal musician in Third Regiment North Carolina Mounted Infantry from January 15, 1865, to August 8, 1865 (seven months), and is not now a pensioner.

Address, Edwin, Tenn.

In his Confederate service he was known as Manley W. Capps and in the Union Army as William Capps and William M. Capps.

His claims under acts of June 27, 1890, and February 6, 1907, were rejected because of a prior voluntary service in the Confederate Army, and as he enlisted in the Union Army subsequent to January 1, 1865, the joint resolution of July 1, 1902, afforded no relief. His claim under the general law was rejected June 30, 1899, upon the ground of no record of alleged rheumatism, and special examination had failed to establish it as of service origin.

The last medical examination, September 3, 1892, rates him for rheumatism, weak heart, and weak mind.

Dr. G. C. Williams has treated him during the last 18 years for rheumatism and resulting disease of heart.

The physician and neighbors say he is disabled the greater part of the time for manual labor; that he owns a small house and lot, worth about \$200, and has no income except the little he earns by the little labor he can do.

As he served in the Union Army seven months and was honorably discharged, a pension of \$12 is recommended.

It appears that this man is not only a traitor and a deserter from the Confederate Army, but that all efforts on the part of the man to secure a pension failed by virtue of the fact that he could not make out his case at the Pension Office. He has been turned down four or five different times. Upon what ground does the committee pension this sort of man? He is what is very properly termed by my colleague, Judge BARTLETT, a tooter and not a shooter.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. The gentleman will find that he had seven months' service in the Union Army after his service in the Confederate Army.

Mr. HOWARD. Oh, the war was over when he had four and a half months' of that service.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. I do not know whether he was a deserter or not. He may have been.

Mr. HOWARD. If he was not a deserter, why did he get into the Federal Army and change his name?

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. That is a pertinent question that I can not answer.

Mr. HOWARD. Did the gentleman make any investigation of it?

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. I can not answer, but I will say that the examiner has reported to this committee that he served seven months in the Union Army; also that he had been rated by the department for certain disabilities. Why his pension was never granted in the department I do not know, but this report shows that by the last examination, September 3, he was rated for rheumatism, weak heart, and weak mind.

Mr. HOWARD. Now, I hope the gentleman will not misunderstand my motive in asking him this question. I am not one of those who think that nobody ought to receive a pension. I think that every man honorably discharged who rendered faithful service to the United States Government in the Civil War ought to have a pension if he is in poverty and want [applause], but I do not believe in pensioning these traitors to the Government, deserters, who can not show a ratable pensionable degree.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. I desire to say that we did not know whether the man was a deserter or anything of that kind, and we can not go into the question of morality. The Pension Committee can not go into the moral character of a man.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from West Virginia yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. For a question.

Mr. TRIBBLE. On page 88, I desire to ask a question about a case—

Mr. HOWARD. One moment. Is that the only answer the gentleman from West Virginia is capable of giving to this particular claim? Is there a record, can the gentleman who introduced the bill—

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. I do not know; the report does not show—

Mr. HOWARD. Is the gentleman who introduced this bill in the House? I would just like to ask him, if he is, and I would be very glad for him to state it.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. I do not know.

Mr. HOWARD. Then, as a matter of fact, the gentleman in charge of this bill admits that he knows nothing except what is incorporated in this report?

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. Nothing except what is shown in the official report, and it is shown that this man served seven months in the Union Army and he was rated for disabilities. It is shown right here in this report.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from West Virginia yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. I am answering his question.

Mr. HOWARD. You say he had a ratable disability; why did not he get a pension from the Pension Office?

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. Because he had no status under the general pension law.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. Yes.

Mr. TRIBBLE. On page 88 of the report I find this statement:

He—

That is, this old soldier—

died in service March 19, 1865.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. What line of the bill, and what page?

Mr. TRIBBLE. I am reading from page 88, near the middle of the page:

Shortly thereafter, Nancy—

Nancy was the soldier's wife—

took up with Gaven, also a soldier, and, having become a Catholic, married him by ceremony on February 15, 1878.

She took up with him and lived with him until that time and then married him. Now, further down, you will find there that the soldier, Gaven—the soldier she married—also had a wife at the time he married her, by the name of Anne Burke, and Anne Burke came to the front and administered on the estate, took his property, and there is no question, as proven by the record, that this woman was never legally married to the man on whose name she got a pension. Now, will the gentleman explain to the House how this committee gives this woman, who is not legally married, never was legally married, a pension when the Pension Bureau says that she was not? Let me read this:

The Bureau of Pensions denied her restoration on the ground that her conduct since the death of the soldier and the passage of the act of August 7, 1882, was in violation of the provisions of said act. The officers of the Church Federation of Charity, of Lincoln, Mo., in pleading for the restoration of her name to the pension roll, say that she married Anthony G. Gaven in good faith, not knowing that he had a wife living (which view is not shared by the Pension Bureau).

Now, my question was this: Here is a woman who was not married to this man. She lived with him in an unmarried state for 10 years, as the record shows, and then married him, he having a living wife. How can this committee, in the face of this fact and the Pension Bureau protesting against it, proceed to give this unmarried woman a pension?

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. It seems to me that the marriage is not the bad part of this. It seems to me a woman who lived with a man for a number of years, not being his wife, when she became his wife that, notwithstanding her former bad conduct, she ought not to be condemned for that.

Now, as to this report here the committee has to take the examiner's report on this to a large extent. We can not go into every question minutely. It would take a year to do it.

Mr. TRIBBLE. You did turn down the Pension Bureau's report when they investigated. She drew two pensions. The report says:

Nancy has been the wife of two soldiers, pensioned as the widow of each; dropped from the rolls as such widow for reasons given above.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. We did not turn down the Pension Bureau's report. If the Pension Bureau had power to act in it we would not take it up at all.

Mr. TRIBBLE. They had the power, but found against it. Now, on page 24, I will ask you another question.

Mr. LOBECK. I want to ask the gentleman from Georgia to read the last part of the statement on page 89.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I did not yield to the gentleman from Nebraska. I ask, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask for order.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record the entire case.

H R. 16528. Nancy Gaven, aged 76 years, is the former widow of Asa J. Moore, who served as a private in Company D, Sixteenth Regiment Wisconsin Infantry, from September 9, 1864, to March 19, 1865 (eight months), and is not now a pensioner under any act. Address, Lebanon, Mo.

She was formerly pensioned under the act of July 14, 1862, at \$8 per month by reason of death of Anthony P. Gaven, her second husband, his death being due to service disability. Her children by the first husband and soldier's were pensioned under act of July 14, 1862, from October 28, 1865, when Nancy established marriage relations with Gaven.

Applicant and soldier, Asa J. Moore, were married about 1851, and lived together until his enlistment, September 9, 1864. They had five children. He died in service March 19, 1865. Shortly thereafter Nancy took up with Gaven, also a soldier, and, having become a Catholic, married him by ceremony February 15, 1878. They lived together until his death, August 31, 1897.

After being pensioned as his widow until 1903, her name was dropped from the roll on the ground that she was not the legal widow, since he (Gaven) had a prior wife, herself an applicant for pension.

This woman was Ann Burke, who succeeded by judgment or compromise in obtaining the estate of Anthony C. Gaven. Ann alleged that Gaven and Nancy eloped in 1866.

Nancy having been pensioned as the widow of Asa J. Moore from the date of his death, March 19, 1865, to October 29, 1865, the date of her alleged marriage to Anthony C. Gaven, the Bureau of Pensions denied her restoration on the ground that her conduct since the death of the soldier and the passage of the act of August 7, 1882, was in violation of the provision of said act.

Nancy has been the wife of two soldiers, pensioned as the widow of each, and dropped from the roll as such widow for reasons given above.

She is now 76 years old. The officers of the Church Federation of Charity, of Lebanon, Mo., in pleading for the restoration of her name to the pension roll, say that she married Anthony C. Gaven in good faith, not knowing that he had a wife living (which view is not shared by the Pension Bureau), and that she felt herself innocent of intentional wrongdoing. Further, she is an invalid, confined to her bed; that she lives with her widowed daughter, who is totally blind and who is also confined to her bed, and the two require the constant care of a trained nurse, and they have neither money, property, nor income.

The Member introducing this bill states that he has known the soldier, Anthony C. Gaven, the applicant, and her daughter for years. Just before coming to Washington last November he visited them, applicant and daughter. He says:

"In the corner of the room was the mother, sick, feeble, and almost helpless; in the center of the room, upon an invalid's bed so arranged as to be wheeled around the room, lay the daughter; so afflicted was the daughter she could only move the tips of her fingers; she could not turn her head from side to side, and she was blind. Nancy Gaven has no property; she and her daughter are dependent upon the county court and upon the charity of the people of Lebanon."

This case enlists the sympathy of all and calls for congressional relief. A pension of \$12 per month is recommended.

Mr. LOBECK. Read the last part.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have made a promise to a gentleman who wants to speak against pension legislation generally. I think it is right for him to be heard on this bill, and I now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY] for 20 minutes.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I have always had great admiration for the truly brave, whether on the battle's front or in the walks of civil life. The first thing, though, I ever took a live interest in reading was the histories of battles. I never tired of reading of the Battle of New Orleans, when Jackson's Kentucky and Tennessee riflemen lay behind the cotton bales until Pakenham's redcoats came close enough for Jackson's men to see the whites of their eyes.

My blood boiled when I read and reread the story of the Alamo, how the heroic Crockett, the dauntless Fannin, and the indomitable Bowie, together with 157 other fit companions, held out against the Mexican army from the 23d of February to the 6th of March. I believe that man can not die better than when facing fearful odds for the idols of his country and the temples of his gods.

I have seen through the eye of history, in supremest admiration, Napoleon at Lodi, Marengo, and Austerlitz; had a storm in my blood when reading the statement of the drummer boy that "he had never been taught to beat a retreat."

I have traced in awe the maneuvers of the valley campaign made immortal by the genius of Stonewall Jackson.

I yield to no man in worship of the heroism displayed by Americans in our Civil War. It was never equaled in the history of the world and it will never be duplicated by mankind, for our people have met their last time in mortal conflict. That is the saddest page in human history, but it is made the most brilliant with exhibitions of superhuman fortitude.

I honor those who immortalized themselves in that strife, and they look alike to me whether on the one side or the other. I have no feeling in the matter whatsoever. I was born, long after the war had ended, in a State that never felt a hostile foot, and reared by a Confederate father who bore no taint of malice. He taught me that fanatics on both sides caused that fratricidal strife, and the memories of its horrors should pass and this country be an indissoluble Union in feeling, as it is in fact.

I honor them whether their jackets were blue or gray, and I will go as far as who goes farthest in paying them homage and doing them honor, but honor can not be paid in dollars and cents. When reduced to a contract basis, the apples of Hesperides turn to Dead Sea fruit. The debt of gratitude paid in cash is no longer a debt. It is effaced forever.

I owe my life to a man who risked his own to pull me from a swollen stream when I was a boy of 13. He has always been my hero. I can never pay him the debt of gratitude I owe him. It never occurred to me that I should become his slave, even had he asked it.

He taught me early in life that a debt of gratitude can not be paid with money, nor honor reduced to a cash basis.

So it is with State or Nation. When materialists want to check up the debt of gratitude and the value of honor and go to the United States Treasury for the purpose of paying it in pensions, it makes me sick. Sick because I can see the grandeur of this Republic, born of our fathers' blood and sanctified by our mothers' tears, passing away. It shows the trend of our thought, the bent of this age of avarice and commercialism. It would lead a man each time he does a patriotic deed to estimate the value of it. When he has a generous impulse the thought will occur, "What dividend will it pay?" His suffrage, which should be a service to his country, will be worth so much.

The progress of pension legislation in this country is a fruitful field for study. It reveals the remarkable power of the human faculties for development in any direction, whether for the weal or the woe of this country's future.

PENSION LAWS BASED ON JUSTICE.

In 1863, when all the promises made by those in authority to encourage men to go to the front were fresh in mind; when legislators knew the hardships undergone by men in the line; when boon companions of the pension beneficiaries made the laws; an act was passed which certainly they thought did justice to their comrades who suffered from the service. This act was amended in some details in 1873.

These acts gave pensions to all injured in the service, their widows and minor children, and graduated the allowance according to the injury received.

They made special provision for those who lost a leg, an arm, an eye or hearing. These acts had the ring of justice in them. They were passed by men who had gone through that conflict. They were passed for the benefit of those with whom they had suffered in that struggle. Those who legislated at that time were the best equipped to do the subject justice of any who have ever acted upon it, or of any who can ever act upon it. They knew the promises made as an inducement to get men to go to the front. They knew the conditions under which they entered the service. They knew the personnel of the men who answered the call. They knew the motives that actuated them and the bounties received. They knew the trials and tribulations of that awful strife. They knew what the loss was in finance and what it was in experience. They knew what it meant, not from hearsay, not from cultivated retrospection, not from fancy, not from the standpoint of political expediency, nor party advantage. They knew from actual experience, from seeing it and suffering it.

No one complained at those laws. The beneficiaries did not contend that those laws were parsimonious nor stingy. They were based on justice. Justice typified by the blind Goddess with the balances in one hand and the sword in the other. The kind of justice that inspires confidence. The kind of justice that makes a republic based on the consent of the governed, a stable government. The kind of justice that makes a happy and a contented people.

Garfield, chairman of the Appropriation Committee in 1876, presenting the pension appropriation bill under those acts, which carried \$28,951,288 and provided for 232,137 pensioners, said:

My idea is, if the gentleman will allow me, that we have reached, and perhaps passed, the summit of appropriations for this object; that it took a number of years to develop, to get through with the regular form of laws to admit to the rolls the persons entitled to pensions, and that the time must necessarily come when we shall pass the climax and begin to go downward. I suppose we have already passed the maximum.

Mr. ADKINS. We reached the maximum two years ago. We appropriated last year \$500,000 less than the year previous, and we appropriated this year a million less than the appropriation in the previous pension bill.

Garfield had rendered distinguished military service. He had been with the men on the firing line; he had heard the roar of shot and shell; he had had comrades fall around him; he had heard the groans of the dying; he had brought back to the grief-stricken wife the sad tale of how her life's dear lord went down with his face to the foe, a patriot serving his country. He had a mind that knew justice and a heart to do it. He helped enact those laws. As chairman of the Committee on Appropriations he was carrying out the laws he had helped to enact when he said, in 1876, all were on the rolls who were entitled to pensions.

THE FIRST DEPARTURE FROM JUSTICE AS THE STANDARD.

In 1890 an act was passed putting—

all persons who served 90 days or more * * * and who may hereafter be suffering from any mental or physical disability, upon the list of invalid pensioners.

This was the first change in the principle of pension legislation. Disability due to service had been the rule in pensioning the soldiers of the Revolution, the War of 1812, and of all other wars up to that time.

That act also provided a pension for the widow of every soldier or sailor and each of his minor children no matter what the cause of his death, conditioned only that they were dependent on their own effort for support. This condition did not apply to the widows and minor children of officers. It provided a pension for them except when they had a yearly net income exceeding \$250.

This was the first general act that abandoned justice as the guide. This was the first act which was generous and liberal. In dealing with the soldiers of the Revolution we had never taken generosity for our guide and liberality for our limit. We had never abandoned justice. The loadstar of this Republic from its inception was adhered to in pension legislation until we got 25 years from the Civil War and the Grand Army of the Republic was organized, cultivated, and encouraged and its political possibilities realized.

When a representative abandons necessity and justice in the expenditure of the public money he has weighed anchor, reefed sail, torn out his rudder, thrown away his chart and compass, and battened down the hatches. He is on the high seas, subject to the pressure of the winds. He is adrift, headed for no port, hedged about by no limitations.

This has been the condition in pension legislation since the act of 1890. There was no justice in that act. What was the reason for putting a man on the pension roll who suffered no injury from his service in that great war. He was as well and able as if he had never had that grand, glorious, and unique experience. What was the reason for putting a woman and children on the pension roll whose husband or father had served in the Army? I have yet to see a man who served on either side in that great conflict who did not regard it a distinction and a grand experience. It is an honor to him and to those who come after him. He never tires of talking of it. Why should he be pensioned if he suffered no injury on account of it? Why should the toilers be taxed to pension the widow of a man who enlisted as much as three months but was never injured and whose death was in no way due to his service? Is there any reason for the children of such soldier being pensioned—the children who point to their father's service as family heritage of which they are proud?

Why, on this bill introduced to-day, carrying 290 special pensioners, I see there is a person who served 3 months and 18 days put on for special pension of \$30 a month. He has been drawing a pension of \$15 a month since 1907. He enlisted in May and quit in August. He had a summer vacation. It says that he suffered no injury in the war, but now he is afflicted with rheumatism. He is in no worse fix than thousands taxed to pay this pension.

But having embarked on a scheme of generosity in pension legislation, bounded by liberality, the act of 1890 was, of course, the beginning and not the end of pension legislation. Thousands of private pension bills were passed each Congress; 9,623 were passed last Congress, and when these bills are passed it will make 1,500 for this Congress. Representatives in the infected districts vied with each other in fulsome flattery of the old heroes. They worked themselves up to arguing, and, worse, even to feeling, that heroism should be rewarded by something more substantial than renown; that honor was empty unless it was accompanied with cash.

THE CONDITIONS IN PENSION TERRITORY.

The Republicans, finding themselves hard pressed in close districts and States, fell back on the old prejudices engendered by the war and made believe the Republicans were the only friends of the soldier. They asserted that the Democrats were southern sympathizers and should they come into power would refuse more pensions and cut what they had. The Democrats met this argument by advocating even more liberal allowances than the Republicans had dreamed of. Representatives of one party prized the other in platform declarations, and were in turn prized. This continued from year to year and from election day to election day. They cultivated a sentiment and created a condition to which they are slaves—servile, abject slaves. Their time and energy is absorbed in pension promotion, and when they are foiled in their efforts, or even questioned about the logic of their position, they get irritable; they

do not argue. They flatter the soldier and malign their opponents. Their condition is to be pitied rather than condemned.

THE TAXPAYERS, NOT THE TAX EATERS, ARE THE HOPE.

There is but one way to stay this drift; that is, combat it at the source. It can not be stopped by argument nor by an appeal to the reason nor the sense of justice of those who are directly or indirectly the beneficiaries. The average man is blind to argument that is against his interest. He is impervious to reason or logic that touches his pocket. He has no sense of justice when he is financially affected. The founders of this Republic recognized these human weaknesses and wisely provided that no judge nor juror should sit on a case in which the judgment or verdict would directly or indirectly affect him personally. The beneficiaries of pensions are average men, neither better nor worse than other men.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to continue for five minutes.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. How much time have I left, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia has five minutes more.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. I yield four minutes, then, to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY].

Mr. CALLAWAY. I thank the gentleman. But for fear the sentiment has been so cultivated and the enthusiasm so aroused by the political devotees of the old soldier that a simple statement of a truism calling attention to a fact will not suffice, and for fear there are many who have been closer followers of the fulsome flattery of the post-bellum political orators than of real history, and for fear some might think I came from too far South to do exact justice to these northern heroes, I want to quote from Charles Francis Adams, a general in the Union Army, to show that these particular warriors were mottled and mixed, even as other aggregations of men are:

The beginning of a war is always in the nature of a picnic—a stimulating novelty; everyone is anxious to have a hand in it in some shape or manner. But after the glow of the first call to arms dies away and real war reveals its grim, repulsive aspect, the response to each renewal of that call to arms grows less and less in volume, until in the case of our Civil War, within the very first year of the struggle (April, 1862) volunteering practically ceased. Under such circumstances, as everyone at all informed on that subject knows perfectly well, there is but one true course to pursue—recourse should be had to a system of conscription, exacting, stern, and even cruel. Permitting the fewest possible grounds of exemption, it should accept no excuses. Our Government in the Civil War, however, never dared have a real recourse to that drastic but alone effective measure. Conscription, in the States of the Confederacy a stern, unrelenting reality, was in the loyal States a scarecrow. Enacted under the pressure of necessity into a law, that law was used as a threat to compel local communities to band together to fill their quotas somehow. Recourse was then naturally had to the bounty system, and this early in the second year of the war. The frightful losses incurred in McClellan's peninsular campaign thus had to be made good.

The communities, local and otherwise, then combined; enlisting agencies were established; and men sold themselves and were bought and delivered singly and in lots at so much a head, like cattle. It was a wretched system, cowardly, wasteful, inhuman; but under it—and it was pursued for three years—men were quoted much as bullocks at Smithfield, a fair average valuation being, say, \$3 to \$6 a pound, the only difference from the Smithfield basis of dealing being that quality was not considered. Anything went.

Needless to say, the material forwarded to the front under such a system—the bogus conscription system—constantly deteriorated. In the Army this was notorious not only to everyone who held a commission, but to every man in the ranks called upon to associate with those forwarded under guard to fill up the war-worn battalions. Desertion and bounty jumping having become a calling were reduced to a system. As the war went on the recruits, recent importations from Europe or picked up in the slums and from the gutters of the great cities, were notoriously looked upon by the veterans of 1861 with averted eyes; objects of contempt; they were treated with scant consideration. Yet these, "the cankers of a calm world and a long peace," to a large extent, constituted what are now known as war-worn veterans, glorious heroes, and worthy patriots.

To one who personally recalls the events of that struggle, its hard, realistic, and mercenary features, the present-day utterances concerning it are a constant source of amused astonishment. In skimming over the columns of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD such can not but marvel at the amount of cant and fustian—nauseating twaddle, perhaps, would not be too extreme a term—deemed useful properly to lubricate the creaking district machinery.

But lest some doubting Thomas should question that authority and still be of the opinion that every man in uniform was a courageous patriot and a hero out to serve and save his country, I will put in a few words from Abraham Lincoln: He said—

he was shocked to find that of 140,000 whom we are paying for in Pope's army only 60,000 could be found. McClellan brought away 93,000 from the Peninsula, but could not to-day cover over 45,000.

As regarded demoralization, the President said:

There was no doubt that some of our men permitted themselves to be captured in order that they might leave on parole, get discharged, and go home. Where there is such rottenness, is there not reason to fear for the country?

THE END OF THE NUMERICAL INCREASE.

In 1900 an act was passed providing pensions for all widows and minor children of soldiers who served 90 days or more who did not have a net income of or exceeding \$250 per year. During these years the increase in appropriations evidence the enterprise and organization of those who received pensions. That year the pension appropriation bill carried \$142,303,887.

In 1907 the generous and liberal legislators passed an act which provided:

That hereafter the age of 62 years and over shall be considered a permanent specific disability within the meaning of the pension laws.

This made pensionable every man who served 90 days or more during the Civil War, except those who had not at that time reached the age of 62 years. All who served in the war reached the pensionable status during the year 1910. Seventeen was as young as any could enlist and all who were 17 in 1865 were 62 in 1910. Since then, every man who served on the Union side for 90 days, and that without reference to whether he was rich or poor, capable or incapable, a creditable citizen or a discreditable citizen, whether a citizen of the United States or a citizen of some foreign country, has drawn a pension. The Union soldiers have all got on the pension rolls. The widows of Union soldiers are all on the pension rolls, the children of Union soldiers are all on the pension rolls, the helpless and idiot children or relatives of Union soldiers are all on the pension rolls.

The average taxpayer who has patiently borne the burden uncomplainingly through all these years, while expense has grown like Jack's bean stalk to the colossal sum of one hundred and sixty millions per year, expected pension legislation to cease. "But alack! and alas! it has been ever thus from childhood's hour, we have seen our fondest hopes decay."

THE BEGINNING OF THE LIMITLESS INCREASE.

The next move was to increase the amount of the allowance, since numerically they were at their row's end.

In 1908 they passed an act increasing the pensions of widows married prior to 1890 from eight to twelve dollars per month. No voice was raised against this act, which shoved appropriations from \$141,464,522 in 1908 to \$155,894,049 in 1909.

The pension forces, emboldened by such successes, pressed through the House of Representatives of the Sixty-first Congress the Sulloway pension bill. It died on the Senate calendar. That was the boldest and most extravagant general act ever seriously considered by Congress. It would have taken \$50,000,000 to meet its provisions. It would have raised the yearly pension expenditures to two hundred million, or about \$10 for each voter in the United States, a little more than seven times as much as Gen. Garfield said they were entitled to 36 years before. The pension advocates say the ranks are thinning. Let us look at the figures. In 1876 there were 232,137; in 1911, 892,098, nearly four times as many as there were 36 years before, when Gen. Garfield said all were on the rolls who were entitled to pensions. They have been able so far to supply more pensioners by law than have been taken away by nature.

A PENSIONER FIRST, A PATRIOT AFTERWARDS.

The complexion of the lower House of Congress changed in 1910, but we were soon to learn that a pensioner is a pensioner. The Democrats came in. The Democrats, whose shibboleth for 40 years has been that—

Public money should not be spent except what is necessary in the honest and economical administration of public affairs.

The Sherwood pension bill, variously estimated to add from forty-six to seventy-five millions to our present pension expenditures, which approximate one hundred and fifty-three millions for this year, accompanied the Democratic shibboleth into the Sixty-second Congress and knocked that shibboleth into a "cocked hat." Gen. SHERWOOD's Democratic bill prizes SULLOWAY's Republican measure. It goes it one better. It is in line with the manner in which the conditions have been created in the States that send pension slaves to this House. A Democratic House pledged to economy and honesty in the public expenditures rammed that bill through. They forced it through in the face of the statement of Mr. FITZGERALD, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, that—

Its enactment sounds the death knell of the hopes of the Democratic Party successfully to reduce expenditures and lower substantially tariff taxes.

They forced it through in the face of the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON], a member of the Ways and Means Committee—

That the tariff on sugar could not be reduced should this bill become a law.

They rammed it through for the purpose of getting with it enough soldier votes to bring them back to Congress and possibly carry their States for the party.

THE REAL PURPOSE OF THE SULLOWAY AND SHERWOOD BILLS.

It was an effort to beat the Republicans to it. The advocates of that measure argued that should the Republicans ever get back in power they would pass then a pension bill that would perpetuate them in power. The proponents of that measure claimed the Republicans would win unless that bill was passed. If it was passed, the Democrats would return. The question, then, was, according to the arguments, whether the Democrats, having the power, should buy that vote with pensions or let it go to the Republicans, who have heretofore held it with pensions.

If that vote can be bought with pension money this year, it can be bought with any other kind of money. If it has to be bought at this election, it will have to be bought at the next election and at the next one. It is not worth the price.

THE REAL SEQUENCE OF SUCH LEGISLATION.

It is not only the cost to this Government in dollars and cents, it breeds indolence and vice in the recipients; it undermines self-respect by removing the necessity for self-reliance; it saps independence and begets dependence.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to conclude my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to conclude his remarks. Is there objection?

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. CALLAWAY. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Is the gentleman going to vote against this bill?

Mr. CALLAWAY. Yes; I am going to vote against every pension bill. I think we are already overloaded with pension burdens.

Mr. RUCKER of Colorado. Has the gentleman more than five Members among his colleagues on this side of the Chamber to join with him in that vote?

Mr. CALLAWAY. I never asked that question. It is not a question of how many will vote with me. The question with me is whether or not I am right.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I have only one minute left.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee gave unanimous consent for the gentleman from Texas to complete his remarks.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the Chairman did not put that question to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has asked unanimous consent for sufficient time in which to complete his remarks. Is there any objection?

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, I object to unlimited extension of time.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. RODDENBERY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RODDENBERY. The Chair had definitely stated the request for unanimous consent and had ruled thereon, and debate has followed thereunder.

The CHAIRMAN. That is true; but the Chair did not put the motion to the committee.

Mr. BEALL of Texas. Did not the gentleman from West Virginia reserve his minute and then demand recognition immediately after the gentleman from Texas concluded?

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, I object, as I say, to an unlimited extension of time. The gentleman might talk a week.

Mr. CALLAWAY. It will take me about four minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent for four minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. OLMSTED. I have no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. CALLAWAY. It supports in idleness thousands who should be engaged in creative employment. They would be better off if forced to rely on their own efforts, and would add to the world's wealth instead of absorbing substance they never created.

That is exemplified, Mr. Chairman, in the difference to-day in the feeling of dependence of the soldiers of the North and the feeling of independence of the soldiers of the South, who have had to depend upon their own energy and exertions for their support.

I want to quote here from no less authority than Gen. Charles Francis Adams, a great-grandson of President John

Adams, on the influence of such gifts as have been made by this Government in pensions. He said:

The matter of provision to be made for those who for any reason are insufficiently provided for is no new question. On the contrary, in one form or another it has as a problem occupied the attention of the individual man, the legislator, and the business administrator or director almost since the beginning of time. And if, as a result of all human experience, through largesses, distributions, charitable bequests and foundations, poor laws and workhouses, doles, outdoor reliefs, asylums, and pensions—the panem et circenses of all times and kinds—one fact stands forth more distinct and indisputable than most others it is that promiscuous and indiscriminate benefactions and givings are a curse to all concerned. In such case the demand always exceeds the supply; feeding on itself, the thing fed grows with an exceeding growth. Impairing self-respect, it saps the desire of self-help. It creates dependents and begets mendicants.

That this is a correct statement of the effect of giving is known to every student of human nature.

And he said, further:

That our pension system tends to pauperize the community by undermining that sense of self-respect always incident to self-support hardly admits of denial; that indiscriminate giving, regardless of individual requirements, restricts the funds available for the relief of the truly deserving and really needy is a self-evident proposition. That such a condition of things calls for reform is obvious.

THE SHERWOOD BILL IS NOT THE END OF PENSION LEGISLATION.

A cursory examination of the speeches made by the advocates of the Sherwood pension bill shows conclusively that they do not offer that measure as the concluding pension act, but simply as one of their pension acts. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK], in giving his views on the Sherwood pension bill, said:

I am a firm believer in generous and liberal pensions.

He then stated that he would include widows without restriction, and that he wanted to strike out the thousand-dollar income provision of the Sherwood bill, and said those opposed to all kinds of pension legislation worked that provision into the bill. Then he asks:

Why let these gentlemen dictate to those who are friends of the soldiers? Let the soldiers' friends make this bill.

Another proponent of this measure states clearly that this bill is prepared at the instance of and for the benefit of the soldiers. He says:

Hence we have tried to do what seems best for the soldiers by preparing this bill * * *. I am also for this bill, because I have ascertained from the soldiers of my district that they are in favor of this, the Sherwood bill * * *. Here is a letter advising me of a meeting held in my district only one week ago by one of the largest Grand Army posts in the district that I represent.

Then he reads the letter as an argument for the bill.

The foregoing are but samples of the arguments made for the Sherwood pension bill, that if passed will increase the tax burdens somewhere between forty-six and seventy-five millions of dollars. The public welfare, the future of the country, the effect on the electorate of the land, or the burden upon the already overburdened taxpayers does not enter into these arguments, but the question is what do the soldiers want; and the promise to them is that their Representatives will get for them now and in the future everything that they can get, and what they can get seems to be limited only by what the Treasury has.

Mr. LONGWORTH, of Ohio, who voted against the Sulloway bill in the last Congress, in discussing the Sherwood bill stated that he was going to vote for it now that the Supreme Court has held the corporation-tax law constitutional, and "that we can afford to pass some pension legislation." He said when the Sulloway bill was before the House last year the Secretary of the Treasury appeared before the Ways and Means Committee and stated that we could not meet a \$50,000,000 charge on the revenues without a bond issue or without additional taxation. We got the additional taxation in the corporation tax, therefore.

It has always been my conviction, and I believe it is the conviction of the average man, that those who are affected by judicial decisions should not determine the judgment, but that the judgment should be rendered by those who are not personally affected and those who can not be affected by the judgment; and the law of the land should not be made by those who are personally affected by the laws or who are direct beneficiaries under the law, and I do not believe that pension grants should be determined by our ability to levy and collect taxes. My views, though, are wholly at variance with the arguments and statements above quoted. The above quotations evidence the influence and motives actuating pension legislation.

THE POLITICAL POWER OF THE ORGANIZED PENSIONERS.

And Mr. Adams further said:

It is safe to say that there is to-day in Washington, or in the world, no influence which, in its power to break down opposition and to bring about the legislative results it desires, at all comparable to the influence which has grown up and become organized under the existing United States pension system.

The present Secretary of the Treasury, the Hon. Franklin MacVeagh, referring to the present Civil War pension system, in April, 1911, said:

That it had lost its patriotic aspect and now become a political list.

These statements show that the men making them knew and appreciated the conditions actuating the men of this House in their vote on pension questions.

According to the statements, arguments, and actions of those from the infected territory, pensions determine elections. It is not party principles; it is not tariff, high or low; it is not whether the Government shall be administered honestly and economically; it is not whether the few shall continue by means of law to take toll from the many; it is not how burdensome the taxes shall be, but how much pension are we to get. Lest some man should say that I am radical in my statement of the motives and influences in this House that backed these measures and pushed them through, I shall quote Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey, a member of the Ways and Means Committee and seven years a Member of this body. He put it bluntly but truthfully, courageously, and like a patriot, not a timeserver:

Fifty million dollars a year is too big a price for the country to pay to bring me back to Congress.

He was speaking of the Sulloway bill. If his words mean anything, they mean that bill was a vote purchaser.

I am going to add here a statement showing the number of pensioners in each State and Territory, each insular possession, and each foreign country on the rolls June 30, 1911, and the amounts paid during the fiscal year 1911, together with disbursements for pensions and for maintenance of the pension system from 1866 to 1911. This does not give an adequate estimate of the political influence of pensioners unless in looking at it you multiply the number of voters by their political activity and concentration of effort.

State or country.	Number.	Amount.
UNITED STATES.		
Alabama.....	3,648	\$596,445.74
Alaska.....	83	15,466.02
Arizona.....	838	139,171.26
Arkansas.....	10,567	1,642,005.59
California.....	29,531	5,067,136.23
Colorado.....	9,138	1,619,447.75
Connecticut.....	11,201	1,872,539.05
Delaware.....	2,555	454,244.10
District of Columbia.....	8,241	1,471,994.53
Florida.....	4,747	815,836.77
Georgia.....	3,386	543,352.41
Idaho.....	2,563	438,664.66
Illinois.....	61,374	10,833,222.56
Indiana.....	54,290	10,281,779.61
Iowa.....	31,402	5,698,518.38
Kansas.....	34,725	6,169,168.06
Kentucky.....	23,701	4,157,678.90
Louisiana.....	6,369	1,024,613.60
Maine.....	15,894	2,946,461.42
Maryland.....	12,015	2,132,611.17
Massachusetts.....	37,301	6,271,153.27
Michigan.....	37,508	6,803,461.80
Minnesota.....	15,217	2,663,654.03
Mississippi.....	4,006	724,961.82
Missouri.....	44,277	7,875,111.93
Montana.....	2,438	404,917.85
Nebraska.....	14,635	2,507,084.41
Nevada.....	415	69,970.12
New Hampshire.....	7,102	1,324,358.53
New Jersey.....	20,978	3,490,412.71
New Mexico.....	2,134	391,671.69
New York.....	75,182	13,172,308.83
North Carolina.....	3,897	654,072.49
North Dakota.....	1,780	333,087.17
Ohio.....	86,474	15,638,286.83
Oklahoma.....	12,318	2,179,264.47
Oregon.....	8,299	1,360,963.81
Pennsylvania.....	85,572	14,646,640.04
Rhode Island.....	5,049	849,318.43
South Carolina.....	1,924	302,562.44
South Dakota.....	5,333	1,065,579.05
Tennessee.....	17,311	3,190,810.87
Texas.....	9,143	1,504,851.63
Utah.....	1,110	190,883.54
Vermont.....	7,214	1,413,376.88
Virginia.....	8,313	1,489,553.80
Washington.....	11,005	1,821,604.85
West Virginia.....	11,388	2,044,688.65
Wisconsin.....	21,328	3,845,894.64
Wyoming.....	985	165,667.09
Total.....	886,444	156,307,131.53
INSULAR POSSESSIONS.		
Hawaii.....	80	14,858.40
Philippines.....	60	16,629.12
Porto Rico.....	36	5,820.00
Panama.....	2	192.00
Total.....	178	37,499.52

State or country.	Number.	Amount.
FOREIGN COUNTRIES.		
Algeria.....	1	\$108.00
Argentina.....	16	2,852.50
Australia.....	103	18,364.90
Austria-Hungary.....	26	6,418.80
Azores.....	6	1,089.00
Bahamas.....	4	792.00
Barbados.....	2	216.00
Belgium.....	24	4,279.10
Bermuda.....	6	\$1,044.00
Bolivia.....	1	180.00
Brazil.....	4	698.00
British East Africa.....	1	144.00
British West Indies.....	3	298.00
Bulgaria.....	1	148.40
Canada.....	2,712	483,539.60
Cape Verde Islands.....	1	96.00
Ceylon.....	2	594.00
Chile.....	12	2,268.00
China.....	18	3,209.40
Comoro Islands.....	1	120.00
Costa Rica.....	4	517.50
Cuba.....	10	10,090.80
Danish West Indies.....	2	224.00
Denmark.....	51	9,092.30
Dominican Republic.....	2	241.00
Dutch West Indies.....	6	948.10
England.....	486	\$6,650.80
Egypt.....	3	330.00
Fiji Islands.....	1
France.....	76	13,549.67
Germany.....	532	95,853.33
Greece.....	8	1,941.41
Guatemala.....	3	465.00
Haiti.....	1	108.00
Honduras.....	2	252.00
Hongkong.....	3	597.00
India.....	17	3,031.10
Ireland.....	462	82,370.60
Isle of Man.....	3	395.50
Isle of Pines.....	2	372.00
Italy.....	61	10,875.30
Jamaica.....	7	1,876.20
Japan.....	34	6,060.20
Korea.....	1	36.00
Liberia.....	7	912.00
Madeira.....	1	345.00
Malta.....	2	324.00
Mexico.....	189	33,705.70
Netherlands.....	10	1,668.00
Newfoundland.....	4	612.00
New Zealand.....	16	2,847.50
Nicaragua.....	2	288.00
Norway.....	77	13,725.10
Panama.....	34	6,048.90
Paraguay.....	1	240.00
Peru.....	14	2,496.10
Portugal.....	5	828.00
Russia.....	18	3,197.60
Salvador.....	1	144.00
Samoa.....	1	96.00
Scotland.....	86	15,333.67
Seychelles Islands.....	1	216.00
Siam.....	1	144.00
South Africa.....	11	1,728.00
Spain.....	3	432.00
St. Helena.....	1	144.00
Sudan.....	1	473.57
Sweden.....	81	14,443.10
Switzerland.....	68	12,126.43
Tasmania.....	2	2,332.00
Tonga Islands.....	2	432.00
Turkey.....	20	3,565.00
Uruguay.....	4	909.60
Venezuela.....	1	144.00
Wales.....	31	5,526.30
Total.....	5,476	978,471.98

Disbursements for pensions and for maintenance of pension system, 1866 to 1911.

Fiscal year.	Paid as pensions.	Cost, maintenance, and expenses.	Total.	Number of pensioners.
1866.....	\$15,450,549.88	\$407,165.00	\$15,857,714.88	126,722
1867.....	20,784,789.69	490,977.35	21,275,767.04	155,474
1868.....	23,101,509.36	553,020.34	23,654,529.70	169,643
1869.....	28,513,247.27	564,526.81	29,077,774.08	187,963
1870.....	29,351,488.78	600,997.86	29,952,486.64	198,686
1871.....	28,518,792.62	863,079.00	29,381,871.62	207,495
1872.....	29,752,746.81	951,253.00	30,703,999.81	232,229
1873.....	26,982,063.89	1,008,200.64	27,990,264.53	238,411
1874.....	30,206,778.99	966,794.13	31,173,573.12	236,241
1875.....	29,270,404.76	982,695.35	30,253,100.11	234,821
1876.....	27,936,209.53	1,015,078.81	28,951,288.34	232,137
1877.....	28,182,821.72	1,034,459.33	29,217,281.05	232,104
1878.....	26,786,009.44	1,032,500.09	27,818,509.53	223,998
1879.....	33,664,428.92	837,734.14	34,502,163.06	242,755
1880.....	56,689,229.08	935,027.28	57,624,256.36	250,802
1881.....	50,583,405.35	1,072,059.64	51,655,464.99	268,830
1882.....	54,313,172.05	1,466,236.01	55,779,408.06	285,697
1883.....	60,427,573.81	2,591,648.29	63,019,222.10	303,668
1884.....	57,912,387.47	2,835,181.00	60,747,568.47	322,756

Disbursements for pensions and for maintenance of pension system, 1866 to 1911—Continued.

Fiscal year.	Paid as pensions.	Cost, maintenance, and expenses.	Total.	Number of pensioners.
1865.....	\$65,171,937.12	\$3,392,576.34	\$68,564,513.46	345,125
1866.....	64,091,142.90	3,245,016.61	67,336,159.51	365,783
1867.....	73,752,997.08	3,753,400.91	77,506,397.99	406,007
1868.....	78,950,501.67	3,515,057.27	82,465,558.94	452,557
1869.....	88,842,720.58	3,466,968.40	92,309,688.98	489,725
1870.....	106,093,850.39	3,526,382.13	109,620,232.52	537,944
1871.....	117,312,690.50	4,700,636.44	122,013,326.94	676,160
1872.....	139,394,147.11	4,898,665.80	144,292,812.91	876,088
1873.....	156,906,637.94	4,867,734.42	161,774,372.36	966,042
1874.....	139,986,726.17	3,863,976.31	143,850,702.48	969,544
1875.....	139,812,294.30	4,338,020.21	144,150,314.51	970,524
1876.....	138,220,704.46	3,991,375.61	142,212,080.07	970,673
1877.....	139,949,717.35	3,987,783.07	143,937,500.42	976,014
1878.....	144,651,879.80	4,114,094.46	148,765,974.26	993,714
1879.....	138,355,052.95	4,147,517.73	142,502,570.68	991,519
1880.....	138,462,130.65	3,841,706.74	142,303,837.39	993,529
1881.....	138,531,483.84	3,868,795.44	142,400,279.28	997,735
1882.....	137,504,267.99	3,831,278.96	141,335,546.95	999,446
1883.....	137,750,653.71	3,993,316.79	141,752,870.50	996,545
1884.....	141,093,571.49	3,849,366.25	144,942,937.74	994,702
1885.....	141,142,861.33	3,721,832.82	144,864,694.15	998,441
1886.....	139,000,288.25	3,523,269.51	142,523,557.76	985,971
1887.....	138,155,412.46	3,309,110.44	141,464,522.90	987,371
1888.....	153,093,086.27	2,800,963.36	155,894,049.63	951,687
1889.....	161,973,793.77	2,852,583.73	164,826,387.50	946,194
1890.....	159,974,656.08	2,657,673.86	162,632,329.94	921,083
1891.....	157,325,160.35	2,517,127.06	159,842,287.41	892,093
Total.....	4,133,936,285.93	120,579,861.74	4,254,516,147.67

If it has come to this, that the giving of pensions is to purchase votes; votes in the pension districts of this country that determine elections, National as well as State, what must be the consequence when that condition is understood and appreciated by the millions of yeomanry who each year pay their taxes and have heretofore biennially marched over the hills to deposit an honest, unselfish ballot in the hope that this Government would do even-handed justice to all? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HAMILTON] has one minute remaining.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be closed in one hour and five minutes; one hour of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RODDENBERRY] and five minutes by myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HAMILTON] asks unanimous consent that general debate be closed in one hour and five minutes; one hour of that time to be controlled by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RODDENBERRY] and five minutes to be controlled by himself. Is there objection?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—I do not know that I will object—I desire to call the attention of the Chair and the attention of the committee to the fact that the fixing of general debate is not in the power of the Committee of the Whole. It rests with the House. Now, I am not going to object, but I do not desire—

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. If the gentleman will yield to me a moment, I would say that I fully understand that I could not do it by a vote, but by unanimous consent, if the committee so desires.

Mr. BARTLETT. Well, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to object to its being done by unanimous consent. I do not oppose that, but I do not like these precedents—that are sought to be set, and I merely rose for the purpose of calling the attention of the committee to it. I think it is a bad precedent, and it ought not to be accepted as a precedent without some sort of protest. I do not object.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object. Before acquiescence in the request, I desire to state that I understand that the request of the chairman of the subcommittee provides for general debate for one hour and five minutes, one hour to be controlled by myself and five minutes by himself. Of course it is to be noted that the gentleman from West Virginia has already consumed one hour of general debate.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. Oh, certainly. I mean five minutes besides that. I want to yield that time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY], who desires to explain a bill here. I do not want a minute of it for myself.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, in order that my colleagues on this side who desire time may have it, one hour may not be sufficient. I expect to use an hour myself. Thus far no Members have requested to be given time. If they desire it before this agreement is entered into I should like to be apprised of it. I have no desire to utilize all the time.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do not want to concur in any agreement that will affect our rights under the five-minute rule. Does this affect our rights under the five-minute rule?

The CHAIRMAN. It does not in any way affect the five-minute rule. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RODDENBERRY] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. Does the gentleman from Georgia want to use some of his time now?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. Otherwise, I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY].

Mr. RODDENBERRY. That can be done at any time. I shall have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RODDENBERRY] is recognized.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, in the discussion of all pension legislation since I have been a Member there has been a manifest absence of dealing with that great question without interjection now and then and ever and anon of nonessentials, of appeals to sympathy, of recounting the heroic deeds of the past. But notwithstanding all that has taken place to do honor and justice to the Army of this country, Members, in my respectful and candid judgment, have not exercised that caution, that prudence, that the real soldier deserves and that the taxpayers of the country are entitled to. There has not been that caution against placing upon the pension rolls of this country the names of persons who, neither by service to the country nor sacrifice for it, deserve to be there; and I am rising now to direct the attention of the House to the fact that while noble names go upon that roll no ignoble names should mar the brilliant page of the great array of Union soldiers who fought for their conscience and for their country as they saw it. I desire to say to you that it is a dishonor to the country and a discredit to the soldiers upon the pension rolls to put side by side with them the names of persons who never served their country, of men who deserted their country, of men who, by legerdemain, by artifice, by favoritism, and by fraud are now enrolled on this great page of honor. We shall discuss it somewhat presently.

Two May months have passed since I came here. On each recurring Memorial Day, to Arlington, beneath the arch built there, and in full view of the massive construction of the Amphitheater of Fame, which has carved upon it the names of the illustrious men of the days of 1860-1865, in full view of the imposing columns of the southern colonial home where the great Lee lived and began his matchless career, I have journeyed with my little children and the other and greater half of my household. There, beneath the trailing vines and under the clear heavens, while the swelling notes of the Marine Band were set in full attune, where but lately the President of this country stood wrapped in the folds of his country's flag, doing honor and reverence to the soldiers of the Union in that great struggle, I and my household have sat, amid the harmony of that far-famed aggregation of musicians, and under the inspiring voice of the orator, the President of the Republic. Along with all the rest, we offered up our devotion, we mingled our applause, and tendered our share in doing honor to the soldiery of the Republic and all that is noble in it.

And when we come to discuss this subject, I would have gentlemen on either side understand that we approach it with nothing save the conception we have of a just consideration of this legislation. I recall well two weeks ago, when this subject was considered, there was no voice then to explain one of these bills. I do not complain, gentlemen. It is a part of the decree of the political life of the country in its legislative procedure. There was no voice then raised in explanation. There was no colloquy indulged in with fairness that light might be thrown upon this legislation. I will not say there was contempt, but there was silent inaction. By and by the powerful Committee on Rules was called together, and in council they prepared what they call a rule to close debate, to close amendment, to close consideration, and to throttle and to shackle this body of the people's representatives. At this moment I see neither the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] nor the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL]; but when that committee repaired to their room to prepare that rule under a Democratic House, I would ask those gentlemen, if they were here, who dictated the rule of February 23?

Whose hand wrote the rule of February 23, which was brought forth to shut off debate and consideration in a Demo-

cratic House? Was it HENRY or was it DALZELL? Go to the room of the journal clerk of the House and see the chirography of that rule and see whether the gag was that of HENRY or that of DALZELL. See whether or not, in formulating the rules for the Democratic majority, it was written by the hand of a Democrat or by the hand of a Republican. Gentlemen, the voice was the voice of Jacob, but the hand was the hand of Esau. No party expediency, no danger of party future, shall let me give my assent that the rules of procedure of the Democrats of this House shall be drafted by the arch Republican gagger of the last 20 years, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], without a protest and without calling attention to the fact.

The bill now before us is smaller by some 60 or 70 names than that of two weeks ago. I note the improvement.

I scarcely find to-day any of these \$50 pensions in it. They tell us the committee has agreed not to put in any more over \$50. They say, gentlemen, that hereafter the committee will not indulge individual Members to rise in their places and quiescently adopt amendments that they have drafted. So after all, if we may say it, perhaps a little publicity connected with this pension legislation will not be detrimental to the country or degrade the Union soldier.

I say to you now that within the last fortnight there have come in my daily mails letters from Union soldiers—not from the South—there have come from inmates of soldiers' homes letters protesting against this procedure and favoritism. There have come from presidents of western universities letters of approval of the position we have taken on this question. They have read the Record. There have come from the State of New York, the State of Pennsylvania, the State of Massachusetts, the State of New Jersey, and elsewhere communications from citizens, some of whom say they were soldiers in the war, emphatically indorsing the position we have taken in the interest of the just appreciation and treatment of the soldiers of the Union Army and in defense of the burden bearers of the country. At some future day we may have an opportunity and the permission to file them in the Record or to read them from the floor of the House, giving Members the information as to the opinion some men in this country entertain in regard to this reckless exploiting of both political parties in the name of the tottering, crippled, and aged Union soldiers.

Gentlemen, it is absolutely appalling that men in their solicitude for their political fortunes, far transcending their solicitude for the Union soldier, should tremble when public discussion of this question is raised. Gentlemen dare not deny the statement from their own lips, from their own utterances—it is heard in the hotel corridor, it is heard in the cloakrooms, and, more than that, it is heard privately on the floor of the House—that this pension question is literally embedded in our politics, and that it will be political suicide to ventilate it. God spare such patriotism and such statesmanship!

Observe here to-day Members of the House, when specific cases of private pensions are brought to the notice of gentlemen who bring in the bill, that they stand without explanation because they can not make it, I assume. They stand without reason and without justification for taking a condemned soldier and a questionable widow and placing them on the pension roll, when I doubt not there are thousands of true soldiers who deserve recognition, and I would not deny it to them.

Oh, the history of the pension legislation of this country! I can not read it without being tedious and exhausting. But we turn to the Commissioner of Pensions' report for 1911. The number of individuals in the military and civil service of the United States during the Civil War is estimated at two million two hundred and odd thousand. The number of survivors of the Civil War on the pension roll at the close of the fiscal year was 539,000.

It is stated by the commissioner that but about 25 per cent of the Union soldiers now survive, and I do not question his statement. We find now on the pension roll the entire remnant of that great army that for four years met that other great army, the like of whose heroism on either side the annals of no history transcend. They are there. Has the country neglected them? Has it declined from any geographical portion of this Republic to do honor and pay tribute and yield support from our Treasury to them in their need, their infirmity, or in their age? I deny it. A thousand general statutes well-nigh have been enacted to provide for every conceivable contingency.

In the same report we come to the special private pension bills. They began very modestly, but now run to the enormous number of twenty-two thousand and odd privileged acts for those who were fortunate enough to ingratiate themselves into the favor of their Members of Congress. Most of

the soldiers of the Civil War are now pensioned under the act of February 6, 1907, and apply for increase only as they become 70 or 75 years of age.

Yet, be it remembered, gentlemen, that long before 1907, beginning with 1861, pension statutes were passed, and vast numbers under those statutes have been receiving pensions. Year by year the pension allowance has been increased. In 1878, 1890, 1899, 1900, and 1907 the restrictions of examination were modified, and the rules were relaxed in order to make easier the obtaining of a pension; the construction of the Commissioner of Pensions has been liberal, has been generous—sometimes well-nigh to a fault.

I will take up somewhat directly the pension legislation. The laws have been extended to the widow and the children and to dependents, and I do not challenge it immoderately. Various statutes provide for furnishing a limb or an arm, and give the soldier the right to take his arm or his lower limb, or to take money in lieu of it.

The Treasury of the Republic, supplemented by treasuries of great States, have provided homes for them, and they are there, cared for in comfort, and in addition are permitted to draw as high as \$17 a month pension in addition to care and support in the home. I here declare to you that I am not one of those who would undertake to consign the Union soldier to a home whether he wills or not. If, perchance, in Iowa, in Indiana, Pennsylvania, or some other State, ill provided though he may be, he desires to spend his remaining years in less comfortable quarters, with less food, with less raiment, than in a soldiers' home, I would not deny that to him. It is but a tribute to, and evidence of, his patriotism. It tells a story that swells the hearts of all of us, that the man, though he may be infirm and needy, loves to linger about the scenes of his childhood and to live and die at the hearthstone of his boyhood and manhood. I would give to them adequate pensions to get the necessities, and let the home be optional with them.

But, Mr. Chairman, that is no justification for an adulterous woman being on the pension roll nor for a deserting soldier drawing from the Treasury of this Republic. According to the report of the Commissioner of Pensions criminal prosecutions are infinitesimal, but you say that it is a broad statement that many undeserved ones go on the list. The same commissioner undertook to check the pension roll in a very gentle, very effeminate way, and with apparent great trepidation to peruse the rolls and make some interrogation as to the record and deservedness of some of them. His report Members have seen. It says that some were found who were perpetrating fraud on the Government, and he says further:

Last fall it became apparent from letters received in the bureau and certain press articles that the impression obtained in some parts of the country that the pension roll was honeycombed with fraud.

Now, make ready to hear:

To settle the question beyond all controversy by determining whether the pension roll was a roll of honor or otherwise, I obtained favorable permission from those in authority over me to check up the pension roll. I mean by that, ascertaining whether every person drawing a pension is entitled to it. The task is no small one, as the bureau must first get the names and the last-known post-office addresses of the pensioners from the pension agents, and then field men must go from pensioner to pensioner to learn whether the proper persons are drawing the pensions.

And, gentlemen, what is the objection that we hear interposed on the floor of this House to such a procedure? It is not that there is no fraud on the pension roll, but that it will cost more money to detect the fraud than it will to pay it. My God, what does such an argument lead us to? In other words, gentlemen, they are there, but let them remain; do not uncover them, for it will cost money.

We owe it to the integrity of the Republic, we owe it to the integrity of the legislative body of the country to investigate. We owe it to the Union soldier and his descendants and to the past and future history of our country to rid this roll of honor of fraud, of perjury, of perfidy, of national shame.

I read again from the commissioner's report:

The special examiners employed upon this work have paid particular attention to the marital relation of the pensioners and have reported thereon, and the data so obtained will assist greatly in disposing of widows' claims when the same are filed.

Why, if they found no fraud, what help would it be?

Here is more of the farce:

Whenever it has been ascertained that a pensioner is known by any name other than that under which pensioned, a full investigation has been made to prove identity and age at enlistment, which will also be of benefit in adjudicating claims which may hereafter be filed.

And so purging the pension rolls is ended. The people of this country will not stand for that whitewash. Standing well-nigh alone before you, and with little open approval from Members, I say to you now, and mark it, that the patriotic soldier, the patriotic woman, the patriotic journal, the patriotic popu-

lace, will not let the pension history of this Nation and its glory be clouded and enrobed in curtains of fraud and of dishonor.

The day of reckoning will come. If this is unpatriotic, then appealing for the honor of the Nation is unpatriotic. If this is demagoguery, then demagoguery is a sleuth in pursuit of fraud. If this is calculated to disrupt political parties or to embarrass, it is no less calculated to render a measure of service to the people who send us here. Read the history of this Republic, and where is there any neglect of the American soldier? As early as 1861 the Volunteer Army was placed on the same basis of pay for disability as applied to the Regular Establishment. A year later \$8 per month was added, and there follows, compiled by the junior Senator from Florida, a well-nigh complete tabulation of the general pension history of the country, and I shall hand it to the reporter and let him incorporate it as a part of my remarks. But, mark you, when our pension outlay is tabulated and summed up, it appears that the Treasury of this Government has contributed for pensions four billions of dollars.

As early as 1861 the Volunteer Army was placed on the same basis of pay for disability as applied to the Regular Establishment. A year later \$8 was fixed for noncommissioned officers and privates and \$30 for officers of the rank of lieutenant colonel and above. To widows during widowhood, or, if none, to children under 16, then to mothers, then to dependent sisters under 16, pensions were granted. In 1864 an elaborate specific disability pension bill was passed, providing a table of rates for certain named injuries ranging from incapacity to perform manual labor to the loss of hands, arms, feet, legs, hearing, and eyesight, the rates of which have been increased from year to year. General provision was made for those who had not suffered such serious loss but who for any reason were so disabled as to render them incapable of performing manual labor, and it was left to the Commissioner of Pensions to determine this general class. On page 122 of a compilation prepared by the Commissioner of Pensions in 1905 will be found the rates fixed by him for disabilities not specified by this act of 1864. The allowance fixed for inability to perform manual labor, due to the military or naval service, was \$15 per month. This amount was increased in 1883 to \$30 per month, and it has been the law since 1883 that anyone so disabled in the service as to be incapacitated to perform manual labor shall receive a pension of \$30 per month. In 1866 brothers and fathers were added to the pensionable class. In 1868 arrears of pensions were allowed to pensioners on account of death, disease, or discharge, but in this act was included a provision that the application must have been filed within five years after the date of death or disability. It would seem that five years ought to be sufficient time within which any person might ascertain whether he had been wounded or disabled, and if within such time a person had not complained of wound or injury the presumption ought to be conclusive that he had not been wounded or disabled during the war.

From 1874 to 1878 the amounts paid out for pensions began to decrease year by year. In 1878 an effort was made to allow arrears in pensions, and claim agents and pension attorneys became active. The Commissioner of Pensions, in his report for 1878, called attention to this agitation and pointed out the great inducements to fraud and imposition. Notwithstanding this the arrears act of 1879 was passed by Congress. It provided that all pensions granted, or to be granted, in consequence of death, wounds, injury, or disease received or contracted during the Civil War, should commence from the date of the death or discharge from service of the person on whose account the claim had been or should be granted, or from the termination of the right of the party having prior title to such pension. The bill as it passed the House fixed no time limit for filing applications. The Senate proposed an amendment to the effect that the application must have been filed by July 1, 1880. This amendment was finally agreed to, although it was vigorously opposed in the House on the ground that it would be despicable on the part of the Government to limit the time of application for pension. The Government was sought to be placed in the unpopular attitude of a debtor in a lawsuit on the common counts, pleading the statute of limitations in order to avoid the payment of his just debts. In the circumstances usually attendant upon the enthusiasm aroused by pension oratory the provisions of the act of 1868 were forgotten. The almost irresistible impulse to take inventory of all the ills and aches that flesh is heir to and attribute them to imaginary disabilities due to a war that had passed into history 15 years before was ignored. At last war neurasthenia was recognized. The commissioner, in his report of 1879, pointed out the easy method of obtaining pensions and the temptation to commit fraud. An amendment was offered to have the United States represented and not allow the proceedings to continue ex parte. This amendment was rejected. The Government was not to be represented; no reflection was to be cast upon the imagination of an applicant or the diagnosis of his friendly physician. It was considered undignified to question the right of any pensioner to receive in a lump sum compensation for disabilities which he might suppose originated 14 or 18 years before. It would have been remarkable if weak human nature had not yielded to this temptation. That it did yield is shown by the remarkable increase in the pension roll. I ask leave to insert table of first payments for the years 1878, 1879, 1880, 1881, 1882, and 1883.

First payments for year ending June 30—

1878	\$2,992,352.17
1879	5,763,758.60
1880	12,468,191.20
1881	23,628,176.61
1882	26,421,669.19
1883	29,906,753.94

These first payments increased from less than \$3,000,000 in 1878 to nearly \$30,000,000 in 1883. Of course it requires time for the Pension Bureau to pass upon these claims. In 1879 the applications were more than double those of any previous year except 1866, when the Army was disbanded, and almost double the rate of that year. The Commissioner of Pensions complained that his office force was unable to keep up with the correspondence. Congress has been appealed to since the passage of this act to repeal the limitation with reference to the time of application, but it has so far resisted the appeal except as to widows. In 1888 the act, in so far as they were concerned, was repealed, and they have thus been enabled ever since that time, by complying with the terms of that act, to receive in a lump sum a pension for the full period of widowhood. Commissioner Evans, in his report

of 1889, cites an instance of a widow who had remarried collecting in one sum the accrued pension which was allowed to her on account of the death of her soldier husband. By the beneficence of this provision in the act of 1888 she was enabled to collect nearly \$4,000 for the use and benefit of her second husband.

In 1890 the so-called invalid-pension act was passed, granting to anyone who had served 90 days or more, and who then or may thereafter suffer from a mental or physical disability, not the result of his own vicious habits, which incapacitates him from the performance of manual labor in such a degree as to prevent him from earning a support, pensions ranging from \$6 to \$12 per month, according to the degree of disability. The disability need not be due to the service; it may have been caused by any act not due to the vicious habits of the applicant. This pension act constitutes both a health and accident policy, issued by the Government. Reference to the table of disbursements, which will be hereafter incorporated, shows an immense increase in the pension roll, on account of this act of 1890. Let it be borne in mind that provision had already been made for disabilities due to the service, and let it also be borne in mind that by act of 1883 the rate allowed for disability due to the service was \$30 per month; in other words, the rates under the general law are higher than the rates under the act of 1890; and yet we are forced to meet, face to face, the fact that immediately 110,000 more persons were pensioned under this act than under all the others combined; and that, beginning with 1890, we were placing on the pension roll a class that could not show, even by ex parte proceedings, disability due to service. By this act widows were pensioned at the rate of \$8 per month who were without other means of support than their daily labor. In 1900, however, they were given a pensionable status, if they were dependent upon their labor for support, and had only a net income of \$250; and in 1908 they were pensioned irrespective of whether they were dependent upon their labor for support, and irrespective of whether they had an income. In 1892 the Army nurses were pensioned at \$12 per month. In the pension appropriation bill of 1906 a provision was made that the age of 62 should be considered a permanent, specific disability within the meaning of the pension laws. By the act of 1907 pensions were granted to any person who served 90 days or more in the Civil War, or 60 days in the War with Mexico, upon the sole ground of age. Those who have reached the age of 62 are entitled to a pension of \$12 per month; 70, \$15 per month; 75 or over, \$20 per month.

It has been a curious incident of our pension legislation that whenever the pension roll shows a decrease, legislation has been enacted the result of which has been to increase the annual amount; as the numbers have decreased, the allowances to those yet surviving have been so increased as constantly to require an increased expenditure.

If, temporarily, this matter has been overlooked for any reason, early opportunity has always been embraced to more than make up for the oversight. I ask leave to print, without reading, table of disbursements from 1866 to 1911:

Disbursements for pensions and for maintenance of pension system, 1866 to 1911.

Fiscal year.	Paid as pensions.	Cost, maintenance, and expenses.	Total.	Number of pensioners.
1866	\$15,450,549.88	\$407,165.00	\$15,857,714.88	126,722
1867	20,784,789.69	490,977.35	21,275,767.04	155,474
1868	23,101,509.36	553,020.34	23,654,529.70	169,643
1869	28,513,247.27	564,526.81	29,077,774.08	187,963
1870	29,351,488.78	600,997.86	29,952,486.64	198,686
1871	28,518,792.62	863,079.00	29,381,871.62	207,405
1872	29,752,746.81	951,253.00	30,703,999.81	232,229
1873	26,982,063.89	1,003,200.64	27,985,264.53	238,411
1874	30,206,778.99	966,794.13	31,173,573.12	236,241
1875	29,270,404.76	982,695.35	30,253,100.11	234,821
1876	27,936,209.53	1,015,078.81	28,951,288.34	232,137
1877	28,182,821.72	1,034,459.33	29,217,281.05	232,104
1878	26,786,009.44	1,032,500.09	27,818,509.53	223,998
1879	33,664,428.92	837,734.14	34,502,163.06	242,755
1880	56,689,229.08	935,027.28	57,624,256.36	250,802
1881	50,583,405.35	1,072,059.64	51,655,464.99	268,830
1882	54,313,172.05	1,466,236.01	55,779,408.06	285,697
1883	60,427,573.81	2,591,648.29	63,019,222.10	303,658
1884	57,912,387.47	2,835,181.00	60,747,568.47	322,756
1885	65,171,937.12	3,392,576.34	68,564,513.46	345,125
1886	64,091,142.90	3,245,016.61	67,336,159.51	365,783
1887	73,752,997.08	3,753,400.91	77,506,397.99	406,007
1888	78,950,501.67	3,515,057.27	82,465,558.94	452,557
1889	88,842,720.58	3,466,968.40	92,309,688.98	489,725
1890	106,093,850.39	3,526,382.13	109,620,232.52	537,944
1891	117,312,690.50	4,700,636.44	122,013,326.94	676,160
1892	139,394,147.11	4,898,665.80	144,292,812.91	767,068
1893	156,906,637.94	4,867,734.42	161,774,372.36	966,012
1894	139,986,726.17	3,963,976.31	143,950,702.48	969,544
1895	139,812,294.50	4,338,020.21	144,150,314.71	970,524
1896	138,220,704.46	3,991,375.61	142,212,080.07	970,678
1897	139,949,717.36	3,987,783.07	143,937,500.42	976,014
1898	144,651,879.10	4,114,031.46	148,765,910.56	993,714
1899	138,355,032.95	4,147,517.73	142,502,550.68	991,519
1900	138,462,120.65	3,841,703.74	142,303,824.39	993,529
1901	138,531,483.84	3,868,795.44	142,390,279.28	997,735
1902	137,101,267.99	3,831,378.96	140,932,646.95	999,446
1903	137,759,653.71	3,993,216.79	141,752,870.50	996,545
1904	141,093,571.49	3,849,366.25	144,942,937.74	994,762
1905	141,142,861.33	3,721,832.82	144,864,694.15	998,441
1906	139,000,288.25	3,523,269.51	142,523,557.76	985,971
1907	138,155,412.46	3,309,110.44	141,464,522.90	967,371
1908	153,093,086.27	2,800,963.36	155,894,049.63	951,687
1909	161,973,708.77	2,852,583.73	164,826,292.50	946,194
1910	159,974,056.08	2,657,673.86	162,631,729.94	921,083
1911	157,325,160.35	2,517,127.06	159,842,287.41	892,098
Total	4,133,936,285.93	120,879,861.74	4,254,816,147.67	

I would not recall a just penny that has gone to the maimed faithful soldier of the country, but I pronounce a curse on every dollar that has gone into the pockets of pensioners by fraud and deception. Deserters are to-day drawing pensions at public expense. I challenge this Congress to provide a legitimate and

adequate method of searching carefully these rolls. Oh, but they say it throws the old soldiers in a state of turmoil while in their last days. Gentlemen, the old soldier who in Pennsylvania, who in Virginia, who in Georgia, who in Tennessee, in obedience to command, with armor buckled about him, with musket on his shoulder, marched without a tremor and without a fear into the face of cannon and into the death of musketry, will never tremble when you seek to investigate his military record and his services. He will welcome it and it will add new luster to his valor and to his glory. Ah, but on the other hand, when you go to investigate, when you go to inquire, when you go to ferret, when you go to pry, when you go to seek out the stealthy pensioner, the meat hunter, the guard hanger, the rear trailer, the tree dodger, the mountain hider, the deserter, the impostor, the traitor, the belligerent who never fought, he will quake and will tremble until his knees will smite together.

And you say that it is no part of a government's legislative duty? These utterances I lay upon the consciences of Representatives, and they shall reach the eyes and thought of the people of this country. If there be treachery and disloyalty in these utterances, I shall be condemned and despised, and deserve no better. If these words, on the contrary, touch upon a festering spot of national shame and finally redound to the honor of the Republic, I shall be content.

Mr. CLINE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. I do.

Mr. CLINE. I have been very much entertained by the wholesale charges of fraud and moral depravity on the part of the Pension Office of this country and the men who are administering it, the impeachment of the integrity and personal honor of every Member of Congress here, and if it is true, as the gentleman says, about Members of Congress voting the public money out of the Treasury to secure their return to seats in this body, those men ought to be impeached.

Now, in this statement that the gentleman made, would not he be kind enough, in assuming that there is a large amount of fraud in the administration of the office of the Pension Bureau, to cite to us a few instances, to get down to brass tacks, to give some facts upon which he bases his allegation. The general statement that fraud is a bad thing and a man ought not to have the benefit of fraudulent action, by the Committee on Pensions, is conceded by everybody, but why not give us some specific instances, enough at least to vitiate the law and make it a reproach to the Members who have enacted it. I would like to hear the gentleman on this point.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. I am glad to have the interruption of the gentleman. No word from me can impeach the Members of this House, but the utterances we make in that regard are made public and will go in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and we stand now and hereafter everywhere by every one of them. I need not say to the gentleman who asked for a bill of particulars, that his own ears have heard his colleagues say, "This thing will beat us for reelection."

Mr. CLINE. I beg to correct the gentleman there.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. I do.

Mr. CLINE. I have no recollection of hearing any gentleman on the floor of this House say—

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Not publicly; I did not say publicly; I stated in conversation, privately, about the hotels.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. When I finish with the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CLINE. If the chairman pleases, I want to purge myself from any inkling of that kind, so far as I am concerned, for I have no recollection of any man who has taken an oath to support the Constitution of the United States and discharge his duties as a Member of this body so far compromised himself as to say that he would support either in public or private a pension bill for the purpose of getting back into this body.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, as the remarks and exposures of Gen. Adams have been so oft quoted, I shall not present them again. You are familiar with them. But I will say to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE] that he can not seek to break either the force of the awful truth of the general's statement read on the floor, for which I stand responsible now and ever hereafter, by demanding a bill of particulars. I am no prosecutor nor pursuer of the individual Members of this House, but there is no one here, on the floor or off of it, that dares tell me that the utterances I make are untrue.

Some of them have been politically trembling, so they have expressed themselves. In my own time and without fear and without faltering, when in my judgment as a public duty it be-

comes necessary to so speak, I shall not hesitate to be even more specific, assuming all responsibility therefor. And, moreover, I say to the gentleman who asks specific instances of men who have perjured themselves to get on the pension roll, invoke the power of this House to afford an exhaustive and impartial investigation. It will develop startling facts. Beyond all peradventure it will verify and establish my statement that crooked records have been straightened; that the charge of desertion has been legislated away; that the deserters have been translated from oblivious shame into well-rewarded pensions; that widows with mercenary motives have imposed on aged soldiers and bound them in wedlock that they might survive to draw their pensions. It will further develop that women who lived lives of questionable repute, as reports of this committee show, are finally rewarded from the Treasury of the Republic; that bounty-seeking men who ensconced themselves safely on the side of the Confederacy when the fighting was light on that side and translated themselves to the Army of the Union when the fighting was light there have gotten on the pension roll. I challenge the House to inaugurate the investigation.

Mr. CLINE. Have you more than one instance where the committee of this House has pensioned a man, or proposed to pension a man, who deserted from the Confederate service in mind right now?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Not right now. But that reminds me—

Mr. CLINE. Just one other question. You got away very rapidly from general legislation to special legislation. My remarks were directed to the general legislation of this House, and then you undertook to back up your arguments by here and there a scattering instance that crops out in the special bills that are filed in this House. I want to ask the gentleman whether he is able to say that Congress has ever refused to investigate any fraud that was properly brought before it?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Not being possessed of the information, I can not inform the gentleman.

Mr. CLINE. What steps has the gentleman taken to have the Pension Office investigated by filing a bill and having it referred to the proper committee, in order to find out whether there was any fraud in the execution of the pension laws?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. I will say to the gentleman, in the first place, there is no necessity for that procedure, but if there is I am taking steps now—decided steps, unequivocal steps, unevasive steps, and fearless steps, if you please.

Mr. CLINE. I want to ask you if it would not facilitate the investigation to file a bill of that character? The gentleman understands this, that with the broad, sweeping declaration, without bills of particulars, or without bringing the matters to the notice of the officers in the administration of this bureau, except by his mere unsupported declaration, no one will pay attention to them.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Perhaps they will not, but the country will. Mark you, now, these words. Some of you have already heard from home, and I can look you in the face, and in my own good time, if need be, I will call names. You have heard already. I will read further from the report of the Commissioner of Pensions:

The special examiners on this work have succeeded in causing the arrest of two bogus special pension examiners—

Is it any disloyalty for a Member in his place to ask for an investigation, when your own commissioner shows that bogus pension examiners are going over the country imposing on the old soldiers of the Republic whom you so much love and we all honor?

That report further says:

As well as ascertaining the names of two others for whom a thorough search is now being made.

And we read:

It was decided to check up the rolls—

Where?

At Washington and Knoxville pension agencies, and by the result to determine whether the rolls of the other agencies should be looked into.

Now look at this investigation. The Commissioner of Pensions says: We will take Washington and Knoxville to check up by and see whether the other pension agencies shall be inquired into. They find, according to this recording and their checking of the books of the pension examiners, fraudulent names on the roll. And how much more investigation has been reported to the House? None. The investigation died in its birth. Ah, my friend, when he wants to know if I can not give one more case, reminds me of the old darky who was charged with chicken stealing. When the overwhelming evidence appeared that Jones had a coop with 30 hens and two roosters in it, and it was proved that Ephraim took a yellow-legged hen and a red-combed rooster; when the witnesses had established

the fact he rose with great complacency when asked, "Ephraim, what do you say?" "Well," said Ephraim to the judge, "the witnesses say they had 32 chickens in dat coop, an ef they only prove dat I got two of them I do not know what they have got to complain of when I left all the others." [Laughter and applause.]

That is the trouble with the gentleman. One case, two cases, are sufficient, I imagine, to put the Congress and the country upon inquiry. Gentlemen pass over it now with great complacency, but the end is not yet. I am glad to know that on the 8th day of March, 1912, the Democratic leaders of the House have so progressed and have so relented of their gag-rule tactics of two weeks ago that they will not repeat it now. [Applause.] If nothing else has been achieved, if nothing else has been attained except to deter this mighty committee in its mad rush to gamble in the pension rolls further, this much has been accomplished. They seem to deem it wise to stop before passing the threshold of another Cannon rule.

I rejoice that the members of the committee will now occasionally rise and answer questions respecting special bills and private pension favors. It was not so two weeks ago. I challenge you to go to the country on the various cases presented this morning, particularly the one presented by my colleague from Georgia, Mr. TRIBBLE, and one exposed by my colleague, Mr. HOWARD, of Georgia.

I challenge you to take those specific cases to the country and undertake to have the people approve your findings. They will overrule you with their ballots and condemn you with their votes from one end of this country to the other. Such bills are indefensible and can not be apologized for.

We may just as well now approach these pension bills as we approach other legislation. Bring these measures in and let the public gaze be turned upon them. Here is a report covering 118 pages, containing 293 separate private pensions. The report is full of instances telling of the turning down of the applicants by the Pension Bureau; and yet, gentlemen, these bills are brought here to be voted upon and passed before any Member can obtain from the Commissioner of Pensions or War Department the complete war record and military career of the soldier. I may confront my friend from Indiana [Mr. CLINE], whom I regard highly, before four more weeks have passed, with pension and war records of some of these pension grafters that will well-nigh answer all of his inquiries, but in 48 hours it is impossible to study out and delve into the military records of 290 men.

Ah, why delve into it to-morrow, when the bill is passed? Why delve into it next week, when these names are on the pension roll? Why not come and let them be investigated and looked into and studied out now? We owe it to the true soldier; we owe it to judicious legislation; we owe it to ourselves and to the country. Do the pensions we now pass comport with the careful analysis and most scrupulous judgment of the House? Other bills will come in here by and by. Gentlemen, take no unction to yourselves that you can place the brunt of this feeble resistance to this legislation on one man, and crush him and go on. Gentlemen, take no solace to yourselves that because, forsooth, the vote on this floor is overwhelming, you can pass these bills over the resistance of a small number and nothing but faint echoes be left behind you.

These days will come again. Then for no vexation, for no parliamentary delay, for no political advancement shall we pursue the course our judgment dictates and directs. Come, gentlemen, hereafter with these bills fewer in number and purer in character. Come with these bills increasing pensions for soldiers who have straighter records and less of kinks. Bring in here the names of widows who are not so distantly related to the alleged husbands that the Pension Commissioner said he could not find that the woman enjoyed any legitimate marital relations. Come with bills for widows who do not need a special law to establish their relations with the soldier, after four different applications to the Commissioner of Pensions have been turned down. Bring the names of men whose records in the Army are so clear that it does not take a special report of the Pension Commissioner or a special act of Congress to take away the stain of desertion and to restore them to the status of faithful American soldiers. Bring forth the needy soldiers of this Republic, and bring with them their dependent children and their helpless widows, and we will pension them as they desire, and the country will approve.

But no longer think that there shall be brought forward this species of legislation to be passed as sausage through the mill without resistance and without impediment. Be not impatient on this question. Conscious of your great majority, with full knowledge of your power and your right to legislate, go on, oh, men, go on, but, mark you, the American people will never

acquiesce in anything which brings infamy, dishonor, and corruption to the pension system of this Republic. From our roll I would strike no poor and disabled man who braved danger or faced death; but on this roll I would tolerate no man who failed in the hour of conflict, who deserted on the day of battle. Nor will the people. But the bills you present and the reports you make cast suspicion in their very language on 40 per cent of them. Turned down because the evidence before the Pension Commissioner did not show they were disabled; turned down because it did not show service; turned down by the Pension Commissioner because it did not appear that the women were related to the soldiers in a legal way; yet they are reported to Congress, and under the favor of the legislators of the Nation given a pensionable status, and thereby given access to the Treasury.

Gentlemen, pursue that course if it is right, and I shall come to shame quite justly. Adhere to this policy, but know well that whoever deserves the opprobrium of the country, in the end will receive it. Go on if you will with this special legislation, selecting out the favored few, and feed them from the Government Treasury. In the days to come retribution will be visited upon those who perpetrate it. Vast as are the numbers of the survivors of this great war; momentous as were the issues they determined, as trembling in the balance was held the fate of our Republic; great as was that crisis, no greater in horror was that crisis than the other crisis that our country confronts—that of turning the pension roll of this country into a roll of pillage and of plunder. When the wealth producers and burden bearers of the country, week after week, see written upon the American pension roll the names of persons such as some of these, it marks a chapter in the history of this Republic that every brave citizen and every courageous soldier will frown upon. It is no encouragement to patriotism. It is no inspiration to youth. It is no honor to true men who merit their just reward.

I implore gentlemen of the House, in the love of country, to cast scrutiny upon further legislation of this character and guard well the roll of honor of American heroes. Do not be partial, do not discriminate. I shall, if my strength lasts, interrogate the committee hereafter with regard to some of these particular items. I have submitted to you what I believe, upon careful and calm reflection, will have a different consideration than you have hitherto accorded. These observations by me, as a servant of a patriotic constituency, have been made. Upon them the country may pass its own judgment. My duty, as I see it, to the utmost is performed. I shall serve with you here in future days, and shall ask no less and no more fair consideration for this legislation than is asked and accorded to other measures.

The power of the majority may, in the language of another, "work its will," but, mark you, gentlemen, when the power of the majority of this country in the days that are gone. In working its will, has ignored the will of the people that majority has come to grief and by the sovereign at the ballot box has been defeated. May I finally warn you, my Democratic colleagues, that so long as we exercise the right and the power of our majority by doing the will of the American people with courage, with justice, and with judgment we may expect and we will retain the confidence and approval of the voters of this land.

When we turn our majority into a tyranny, into an autocracy composed of one, or into a dynasty composed of a few, contrary to the fundamental principles of a Democracy, contrary to the patriotic convictions of our people, then, gentlemen, the day of our undoing comes, and then will we forfeit national trust and national confidence.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has two minutes.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. I can not yield. I wish the gentleman had interrupted me earlier and then I would gladly have yielded. I must respectfully decline now.

No star in the emblem of this Republic should ever be dimmed by the stain of an ignoble name on our pension roll. No flag that waves over an American democracy should ever be anything less than the insignia of popular government.

To this democratic Republic it is imperative that the peoples' Representatives guard the Treasury, legislate for the masses of our countrymen, maintain with honor the roll of our soldiery, establish by wise laws equal and exact justice between all men, whether widows, whether soldiers, whether farmers, whether laborers, whether taxpayers. The bone and sinew of this Republic which achieves its fortunes, creates its wealth, will never hesitate to bear with cheerfulness the just burdens of raising

millions of wisely expended revenue, but the yeomanry of these States will rebel and refuse to follow that party or that majority which places about their necks the yoke of unequable taxation or the shackles of galling pension legislation. Mr. Speaker, I have done. [Applause.]

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY].

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, a little while ago in the discussion of this question the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE] called the attention of this House to an item in this bill and asked that it be placed in the Record, and in doing so he called the attention of the House to the fact, or rather made the allegation, that the claimant in this case is unworthy because of her character.

Let me say to you that I have been a Member of this House but a little while, but should I serve in this great body for 20 years I shall never knowingly introduce into this body a pension measure against the applicant of which there can be truthfully said a single word as to his or her high moral character. If I did I would render myself unworthy of the respect of my fellow Members. [Applause.]

I have known the applicant in this case for more than a third of a century. She lives in my home town. I want briefly, because I must be brief in the time allotted to me, to give you a history of this case. Her first husband was named Moore. He died while in the service. Shortly afterwards she married Anthony C. Gaven. With him she lived in the town of Lebanon for many years. He was the proprietor of a little corner grocery store. I traded with him often. In 1897 he passed away. His widow, Nancy Gaven, applied for a pension and received a pension. Just a little while afterwards there appeared upon the scene a woman who claimed to be his wife by a prior marriage. The matter was taken into the court and she proved her claim, and every bit of the property belonging to Gaven was given to this woman, who claimed to be his first wife. When this woman appeared upon the scene the people of the entire town were absolutely astounded. They had never dreamed of such a thing, and so far as I know, and so far as our people know, and we believe, that this claimant, Mrs. Gaven, when she married Gaven, had no idea that he then had a living wife. Nancy Gaven then applied for a pension as the widow of Asa J. Moore, her first husband, who had died while in the service. That claim was rejected upon the ground that she had married Gaven while he had a living wife.

I say to you that there can be no immorality attached to this widow upon that ground. I want to say to you here and now that you can go down to that little city and talk to the citizens of my town, and you will not find a single person who in all these 30 years has looked upon this woman or upon Gaven himself with any other idea than that they were both of high character.

I want to say further that on Sunday before I started to Washington I visited this little home. I went into a little cottage, and in that cottage I witnessed a scene which, I say to you, my friends, I hope I may never again witness in all my life. In one corner of the room, in an invalid chair, was the widow whose case is now under discussion. In the center of the room, upon a cot so constructed as to be easily moved from place to place, lay her invalid daughter, a woman from 30 to 35 years of age. This daughter could move only her fingers and her toes. She was absolutely unable to move herself, even to turn her head from side to side. Not only that, but that daughter was blind—from her eyes had been shut out for many years the light of day. In that condition this young woman, the daughter of a soldier and the daughter of this claimant, had been lying for more than 10 years. They have absolutely no property. They have been supported by the people of my own city, and this \$12 a month that in justice to her has been awarded by this committee will not pay for the nurse hire necessary to take care of them during the long days and nights they must lie there and suffer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, during all these years this claimant and her invalid daughter have been kept up by the people of my town. The woman who came and claimed to be the wife by a former marriage got every bit of the property that belonged to Gaven and to-day these people are upon the charity of my city and county. That case is a worthy one, and if there were against the character of this claimant the least possible stain I would not be here asking this House to give her a pension.

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUBEY. Certainly.

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio. Is it not true that this woman, the widow of two veterans, the first having been shot down in the service and the second having seen long service, has received the support of the officers of the church federation of charity of the town of Lebanon, Mo.?

Mr. RUBEY. That is true.

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio. And is it not true that this old woman is past 76 years of age?

Mr. RUBEY. That is true; and in addition to that I will say that the ladies of my town take care of her, and the officers and others of the federation of churches in my town visit her and look after her, and there is not a lady in my town who holds that there is anything of immorality which attaches to the character of this old lady or they would not be doing that sort of thing.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUBEY. Certainly.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. I just want to say to the gentleman that when the time comes if he will move to double that pension I am one Member of Congress who will vote to increase it. [Applause.]

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, as was suggested by the gentleman from Ohio, this woman lies in a helpless condition, the widow of two soldiers, one who lost his life in the defense of his country, and the other who was wounded in battle. There with her, depending upon her, and upon the neighbors for subsistence, is the invalid daughter of one of those soldiers. These good women have asked me to present this case to the Congress of the United States; and let me say if this is the kind of bills that my two friends from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE and Mr. RONDENBERY] are going to bring up here and criticize, then I say the more they criticize the better it will be, because this is an absolutely worthy case. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. By order of the House, general debate is now closed, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of John W. Turner, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, in the preparation of this bill there was a mistake made. The pensioner is now drawing \$24, and it was the intention to allow him \$30, and I have a certificate here from the Pension Bureau to that effect, and I move to strike out the figures "24" and insert the figures "30."

Mr. TRIBBLE. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. Yes, sir.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I understand that is purely a clerical error?

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. Yes; I will read what—

Mr. TRIBBLE. That is all the answer I desire.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. It is the indorsement of Mr. Albert, the examiner, saying that it is an inadvertence, and it ought to be \$30.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out, in line 8, page 1, the word "twenty-four" and insert the word "thirty."

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, in reply to what Gov. RUBEY has just said—

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion is debatable, and the gentleman from Georgia has a right to debate the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. But the gentleman does not want to talk to this amendment.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I have the floor under the rule. I desire to say, Mr. Chairman, that there is not a man in this House for whom I have a higher regard than I have for my friend from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY]. I think he is a man of the highest honor, but Gov. RUBEY failed to explain a few things to this House. I am satisfied that it is very easy to explain these things to my friend from West Virginia here, who is anxious to help his soldier friends, but my friend from West Virginia, before he goes back to his constituents, had better read the report of this committee and a few things contained therein before he makes such a broad statement. I know my friend from West Virginia to be one of the best Representatives among the new Members and a just and fair man. Now, the committee made this statement. It says:

Shortly thereafter—

That is, after 1865, when this woman's husband died—Nancy took up with Gaven.

And she lived with him in that state until 1878, and then she became a member of the Catholic Church, and under the rules of the Catholic Church they forced her to marry him.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. TRIBBLE. No, sir; I have only five minutes. The gentleman has had his say.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIBBLE. No, sir; I have only five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman refuses to yield.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Now, Mr. Chairman, I call attention to this fact. Here is a bureau refusing to accept the proposition that this woman did not know that a wife of the man with whom she lived and later married was living; they refused it. Now, look to the action of the committee. It promptly overrules the bureau and grants a large pension. I call attention to another fact, that when this man died his wife turned up promptly. She was there to get the property, and yet in the face of all these facts the committee comes into this House and says that these people had been living together for 25 or 30 years, and Nancy did not know that this other woman was in existence. But she was there when the property was to be administered.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention to some other cases as I go along. On page 24, and I desire gentlemen to read it, there they say, "this woman's claim was rejected in 1909 on the ground that she was not the legal widow of the soldier, as she had a former husband living and undivorced when she married the soldier." Now, Mr. Chairman, this question is not contradicted, nobody undertakes to deny that proposition, but what do they do? They come in here and undertake to protect her by saying that when she married she was so young, under the laws of the State the marriage was invalid. Let us see whether it was invalid or not. The courts of the State of Pennsylvania make this ruling, and it was in that State where the parties lived and where the contest came up:

The Pension Bureau held, following a decision of the courts of Massachusetts, wherein it was held that the age of consent in that Commonwealth, as by the common law, was 12 years for females and 14 for males, and that a marriage between two infants above these ages was valid without the consent of their parents or guardian, notwithstanding the statutes prohibit magistrates, etc.

The court says the Pennsylvania statute on this question is—

Merely directory and was a corrective measure and aimed at the prevention of youthful marriages, and that there was no provision declaring such marriages void in the event that they were good as at common law.

The court and Pension Bureau held the marriage valid.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for just one minute, not for the purpose of entering into a discussion of this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD speeches made by the Hon. OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD, of Alabama, on "The protection of profits" before the Southern Society of New York on December 16, 1911, and on "George Washington" before the State Society of the Cincinnati in Philadelphia on February 22, 1912, and on "Federal Government and public roads" before the American Automobile Association Convention on January 16, 1912.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing the three speeches he has designated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HOWARD. The following are the speeches referred to:

PROTECTION OF PROFITS.

ADDRESS OF HON. OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD, OF ALABAMA, DELIVERED AT THE ANNUAL BANQUET OF THE SOUTHERN SOCIETY OF NEW YORK ON THE 16TH DAY OF DECEMBER, 1911.

"The kaleidoscope of political issues must and will continually change with the changing conditions of our Republic, but there is one question that was with us in the beginning and will be in the end, and that is the most effective, efficient, and fairest way of equalizing the burdens of taxation that are levied by the National Government. Of all the great powers that were yielded to the Federal Government by the States when they adopted the Constitution of our country the one indispensable to the administration of public affairs is the right to levy and collect taxes. Without the exercise of that power we could not maintain an army and navy; we could not establish the courts of the land; the Government would fail to perform its function if the power to tax were taken away from it. The power to tax carries with it the power to destroy, and it is, therefore, a most dangerous governmental power as well as a most necessary one.

"There is a very clear and marked distinction between the position of the two great political parties of America as to how power to tax should be exercised in the levying of revenue at the customhouses.

REPUBLICAN PARTY HAS ALWAYS STOOD FOR PROTECTION.

"The Republican Party has maintained the doctrine that taxes should not only be levied for the purpose of revenue, but also for the purpose of protecting the home manufacturer from foreign competition. Of necessity protection from competition carried with it a guaranty of profits. In the last Republican platform this position of the party was distinctly recognized when they declared that they were not only in favor of the protection of the difference in cost at home and abroad, but also a reasonable profit to American industries.

DEMOCRATIC PARTY FOR TARIFF FOR REVENUE ONLY.

"The Democratic Party favors the policy of raising its taxes at the customhouse by a tariff that is levied for revenue only, which clearly excludes the idea of protecting the manufacturer's profits. In my opinion, the dividing line between the positions of the two great parties on this question is very clear and easily ascertained in theory. Where the tariff rates balance the difference in cost at home and abroad, including an allowance for the difference in freight rates, the tariff must be competitive, and from that point downward to the lowest tariff that can be levied it will continue to be competitive to a greater or less extent. Where competition is not interfered with by levying the tax above the highest competitive point, the profits of the manufacturer are not protected. On the other hand, when the duties levied at the customhouse equalize the difference in cost at home and abroad, and in addition thereto they are high enough to allow the American manufacturer to make a profit before his competitor can enter the field, we have invaded the domain of the protection of profits. Some men assert that the protection of reasonable profits to the home manufacturer should be commended instead of being condemned, but, in my judgment, the protection of any profit must of necessity have a tendency to destroy competition and create monopoly, whether the profit protected is reasonable or unreasonable.

UNFAIRNESS OF PROTECTION.

"You should bear in mind that to establish a business in a foreign country requires a vast outlay both in time and capital. Should the foreign manufacturer attempt to establish himself in this country he must advertise his goods, establish selling agencies and points of distribution, before he can successfully conduct his business. After he has done so, if the home producer is protected by a law that not only equals the difference in cost at home and abroad, but also protects a reasonable or unreasonable profit, it is only necessary for him to drop his prices slightly below the point that the law has fixed to protect his profits, and his competitor must retire from the country or become a bankrupt because he would then have to sell his goods at a loss and not a profit if he continued to compete. The foreign competitor having retired, the home producer could raise his price to any level that home competition would allow him, and it is not probable that the foreigner who had already been driven out of the country would again return, no matter how inviting the field, as long as the law remained on the statute books that would enable his competitor to again put him out of business.

INIQUITY OF THE PROTECTION OF PROFITS.

"Thirty or forty years ago, when we had numbers of small manufacturers, when there was honest competition without an attempt being made to restrict trade, and the home market was more than able to consume the production of our mills and factories, the danger and the injury to the consumer of the country was not so great or apparent as it is to-day, when the control of many great industries has been concentrated in the hands of a few men or a few corporations, because domestic competition was prohibited. When we cease to have competition at home and the law prohibits competition from abroad by protecting profits, there is no relief for the consumer except to cry out for Government regulation. To my mind there is no more reason or justice in the Government attempting to protect the profits of the manufacturers and producers of this country than there would be to protect the profits of the merchant or the lawyer, the banker or the farmer, or the wages of the laboring man. In almost every line of industry in the United States we have as great natural resources to develop as that of any country in the world.

"It is admitted by all that our machinery and methods of doing business are in advance of the other nations. By reason of the efficient use of American machinery by American labor, in most of the manufactures of this country the labor cost per

unit of production is no greater here than abroad. It is admitted, of course, that the actual wage of the American laborer is in excess of European countries, but as to most articles we manufacture the labor cost in this country is not more than double the labor cost abroad. When we consider that the average ad valorem rate of duty levied at the customhouse on manufactures of cotton goods is 53 per cent of the value of the article imported, and the total labor cost of the production of cotton goods in this country is only 21 per cent of the factory value of the product, that the difference in labor cost at home and abroad is only about as 1 is to 2, and that 10 or 11 per cent of the value of the product levied at the customhouse would equal the difference in the labor wage, it is apparent that our present tariff laws exceed the point where they equalize the difference in cost at home and abroad, and we realize how far they have entered into the domain of protecting profits for the home manufacturer.

WOOL, IRON, AND STEEL.

"This is not only true of the manufacture of cotton goods, but of almost every schedule in the tariff bill. To protect profits of necessity means to protect inefficiency. It does not stimulate industry, because a manufacturer standing behind a tariff wall that is protecting his profits is not driven to develop his business along the lines of greatest efficiency and greatest economy. This is clearly illustrated in a comparison of the wool and the iron and steel industries. Wool has had a specific duty that when worked out to an ad valorem basis amounts to a tax of about 90 per cent of the average value of all woolen goods imported into the United States, and the duties imposed have remained practically unchanged for 40 years. During that time the wool industry has made comparatively little progress in cheapening the cost of its product and improving its business methods. On the other hand, in the iron and steel industry the tariff rate has been cut every time a tariff bill has been written. Forty years ago the tax on steel rails amounted to \$17.50 a ton; to-day it amounts to \$3.92. Forty years ago the tax on pig iron was \$13.60 a ton; to-day it is \$2.50. The same is true of most of the other articles in the iron and steel schedule, and yet the iron and steel industry has not languished, it has not been destroyed, and it has not gone to the wall. It is the most compact, virile, fighting force of all the industries of America to-day. It has long ago expanded its productive capacity beyond the power of the American people to consume its output and is to-day facing out toward the markets of the world, battling for a part of the trade of foreign lands, where it must meet free competition or, as is often the case, pay adverse tariff rates to enter the industrial fields of its competitor.

DUTY OF THE GOVERNMENT—GENUINE TARIFF REDUCTION TO A REVENUE-PRODUCING BASIS ONLY.

"Which course is the wiser one for our Government to take? The one that demands the protection of profits, the continued policy of hothouse growth for our industries, the stagnation of development that follows where competition ceases, or, on the other hand, the gradual and insistent reduction of our tariff laws to a basis where the American manufacturer must meet honest competition, where he must develop his business along the best and most economic lines, where when he fights at home to control his market he is forging the way in the economic development of his business to extend his trade in the markets of the world? In my judgment, the future growth of our great industries lies beyond the seas.

"A just equalization of the burdens of taxation and honest competition, in my judgment, are economic truths; they are not permitted to-day by the laws of our country. We must face toward them and not away from them.

"What I have said does not mean that I am in favor of going to free-trade conditions or of being so radical in our legislation as to injure legitimate business, but I do mean that the period of exclusion has passed and the era of honest competition is here.

"Let us approach the solution of the problem involved with the determination to do what is right, what is safe, and what is reasonable."

GEORGE WASHINGTON.

ADDRESS OF THE HON. OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD, OF ALABAMA, DELIVERED AT THE ANNUAL BANQUET OF THE STATE SOCIETY OF THE CINCINNATI, HELD IN PHILADELPHIA ON WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1912.

"Surely by no other body could this great anniversary of the Nation be more appropriately celebrated than by your society of splendid traditions, for Washington not only took an important part in its formation, but, in large measure, became its directing head during the early days when its continued existence was threatened by adverse criticism.

"Those of you who enjoy membership in this society may well be congratulated, for it is a privilege greater than membership in any order of aristocracy or nobility of however distinguished rank or origin, because eligibility for it means that you can trace your ancestry back to the great men who served this Nation in an accomplishment which has had more to do than any other single event with the shaping of the political progress not only of this country but of the world.

IMPORTANCE OF COMMEMORATIVE EXERCISES.

"All of us, however, that have not this privilege may have a share which should not yield even to you in gratitude to those who wrought such momentous things. And it is on such occasions as this, which are altogether too few, that duty and interest as well should prompt us to resolve to see to it that grave matters affecting the public welfare shall not hereafter, as often as they have been in the past, be subordinated to our personal or political affairs. In such a way we shall make the wisest use of this day.

"The place and the time are not appropriate for us to attempt anything like an inventory of our assets as a people, for, as men of different political faith, we might not be in accord as to how the inventory should be taken. There are some acquisitions we have made which, from my point of view, are to be regarded as unfortunate, since in securing them it may be said that we have overlooked what concerned our national well-being. All of us at times are capable of forgetting that things in life have a relative as well as an absolute value. If, in obtaining something, we have lost something, we are not, in making up the items of our resources, whether national or personal, to disregard the debits; but we are to have a balance sheet so that we know how it really is with us. The headlong rush for possessions or advantage exposes us to the risk of many a rough fall; and as time goes on the homely adage, 'All is not gain that is got into the purse,' has a widening application to nations as well as to men.

SUBJECT STATED.

"Yet certainly at a time like this, though we may hope to say little, if anything, new, we can, whether Democrats or Republicans, without debate or controversy, take counsel with ourselves as to some of the underlying considerations which have made our Nation what it is, and which, if adhered to, will keep it strong and righteous and capable of resolving the doubts and surviving the dangers likely to confront us as time goes on; and to what wellspring so refreshing and invigorating can we better have recourse than to the career and to the words of Washington! Some of us have no great respect for the so-called referendum; but we all ought to approve of a referendum of what politically is new and untried and uncertain and of doubtful worth to his counsel, from which proceeded always light and judgment.

HONOR ROLL OF THE FOUNDERS.

"It is an inspiration to the loyal American citizen merely to call the roll of the men in whose brain and heart was born the conception of the Republic, who laid its foundations so deep and lasting that there is no height to which we might not build, whereon to keep burning a great light for our guidance and for the guidance of all people; who drew a Declaration of Independence which voiced, as it has never been voiced before, the longing of men for political liberty; who carried the Colonies through a well-nigh hopeless struggle; who devised the Articles of Confederation—that 'firm league of friendship'—as a modus vivendi for a people under arms, and then supplemented it with a Constitution that welded together into an indissoluble Union the interests to which war had given only temporary cohesion—a Constitution which, under the interpretation of John Marshall, was to be, as he said, a document not of definition but of enumeration, and therefore of increasing and broadening significance such as perhaps no other similar writing before has ever had.

"There were giants in the earth in those days.' In no other period in our history, or perhaps of the history of the world, were there gathered together so many gifted men, each with his special capacity for contribution to the success of a nation's cause, as Washington, Jefferson, Franklin, Madison, Patrick Henry, the Adamses, Edmund Randolph, Robert Morris, Charles Carroll, of Carrollton, and James Wilson, too, so intimately identified with this Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and all the other heroes of discontent, of war, of reconstruction, or of the establishment of the Union.

"To shine at all in such a galaxy was to shed a great light; but the calm and steady light of Washington was, by common consent, the brightest in glory there. In peculiar equipment for each class of work required to be done, he may have been outshone. The protest against English misrule may have come

from better-disciplined minds than his; even more brilliant military resourcefulness than he possessed there may have been; in constructive statesmanship he perhaps had his superiors; in knowledge of the political problems to be worked out by the American Colonies through a constitutional form of government, his insight was not always the clearest.

CENTRAL FIGURE OF THE TIMES.

"Nevertheless, it can be confidently said that Washington combined in himself, more than did anyone else, a greater number of those unique qualities essential to make what might easily have been a crude experiment of revolt a success upon which the world still looks with increasing admiration. In the prosecution of the war with unrivaled patience under disheartening conditions and numberless privations and cruel disappointments; in his contribution to the steps leading up to the Constitutional Convention, during all the time from the first meeting of the Virginia and Maryland commissioners down to the calling and holding of the convention; in his advice to that convention and in his presiding over it; in his administration of the Presidency, where he put aside the petty things of politics; in his relinquishment of office when, for the asking, it was within his possession during all the years of his life, Washington, in influence and wisdom and judgment, is the central figure of those times, and in just fame stands alone. And should we ask ourselves to-night which of these men could have been spared in the work that was accomplished, we could not, with all our admiration for any other man, conceive the outcome as it was without the commanding presence of Washington.

"He did not foresee all the perplexing problems with which we have to deal to-day in our tariff or in our great corporations, in our currency, in our foreign possessions, or in a reconciliation of the rights of labor and capital; he did not foresee the vast task we all have, whether native or foreign born, of taking the new material constantly coming to our shores and assimilating it into our growth and molding it into a loyal and intelligent support of our institutions; he did not foresee the menace of destructive socialism nor the extent to which, unfortunately, we were to go in substituting party interest for political principle, though as to this he gave us paternal warning. Nevertheless he did foresee sufficient of our problems to be able to commend to us a course the principles of which, if steadily adhered to, should bring us safely through all the perils to which we may be exposed. While he did not outline the by-laws, so to speak, that must, from time to time, be framed and adopted for the detailed life of this country, he did understand as no one else understood the organic principles upon which were to rest the security and the welfare of our national life. And subject always to his urgent advice against permanent alliances with foreign powers, like a high priest among men he preached the gospel of tolerance, of benevolence, of peace, of reasonableness, and of righteousness toward all peoples.

"Not without faults, not without limitations of intelligence or of those qualities which go to make up the perfect man, Washington manifested in word and deed the best that has gone to dignify and make great and honored American manhood. When there is taken into consideration what he did for us and for the peoples of the earth that have followed or are ready to adopt our example by transferring so much of his conceptions and accomplishment as may be made to take root and grow in their soils; what he did toward establishing the principle that men have the capacity to govern themselves, and that those chosen to represent the people are to be their servants and not their rulers, and that public officials are engaged in the administration of a trust; when we consider that but for his triumphant leadership this Republic would never, perhaps, have been born, and that but for the example of his successful administration of the Presidency the experiment of self-government might have collapsed or retrograded into a kingdom, we must all agree that Washington performed a service for us and our posterity and for all the nations of the earth greater than any like service ever performed by the nobility or the genius or the sacrifice of any other one man.

FAREWELL ADDRESS.

"To appreciate the bold outlines of his personality and at the same time the patriarchal attitude he was entitled to assume toward the Republic, which was so much of his own making, we have only to read his Farewell Address—that wonderful product of affection and intelligence and insight. We can not think of it as written by any one of his contemporaries. The tone of it forbids this. Not one of them could have made use of its language without being open to the charge of affectation or arrogance. The words of dignity and injunction and warning came naturally from him, for they were the words of the guardian to the Nation as his ward, or, as he said, of an old and

affectionate friend. He was the Gamaliel at whose feet the people sought wisdom. He was, in truth, the Father of his Country, as he enjoined upon us all those virtues and practices which can keep us strong and just and prosperous at home and respected in the councils of the world.

LESSONS OF HIS LIFE—CHARACTERISTICS.

"So many are the lessons we can gather from his life and his work that one is justified in saying that on an occasion like this the time is too limited even to enumerate them. Yet there are one or two things which we may well recall at a time when so many of us are disposed to seize upon the first expedient which seems to make for popularity or progress and when old-fashioned truths give way to strange doctrine; for, unlike many of us, he did not, in conduct or in speech, seem of the view that a thing is necessarily valuable because it is new. Courageous, but regardless of the value of precedent, certainly with truth it can be said that he had what a distinguished foreign diplomat recently declared we as a people have—the tenacity of tradition and the audacity of progress.

"The lines of calm serenity and determination along which Washington worked out his life were rarely varied. Persistent of purpose, he was never obstinate or unreasonable in judgment nor without the realization that the means to be selected must have reference to the end to be attained; he did not make of consistency a fetish, but change of plan with him was a matter of deliberation and conviction; he accommodated the plans of his official life, as he did his plans as a general, to the need of the hour, making use of all the resources he could command for the purpose of influencing men by conversion to a course of action believed by him to favor the successful outcome of worthy effort. Not without a shrewdness far beyond that which we are accustomed to attribute to him, he never resorted to measures or methods that were cheap or beneath his dignity. Seeing great visions, he was no mere dreamer of dreams; and what he accomplished for political liberty in association with the development of our national prosperity is an object lesson to us all that the ideal may go hand in hand with the practical for the realization of its highest ambition. He was patient and forbearing under unjust censure and coarse libel, and displayed charity toward friends and enemies as each class had the need for it; he could be what so many of us find it impossible to be—temperate in speech and conduct and considerate of the opinions of others; but when the occasion forbade it he made no surrender to compromise. The choice of no party for elevation to office and the foe of undue partisan zeal, he recognized the likelihood that party lines must be reckoned with; he adhered always to the fundamental things upon which the character of nations must be built if they are to be enduring; and above all he has never been weighed in the balance by posterity and been found wanting in that sincerity which, in the end, is the convincing argument, the best strategy, and the surest way to keep our self-respect.

DISTINGUISHING COMMON SENSE AND PRACTICAL TURN OF MIND.

"His distinguishing common sense and practical turn of mind served him well in the administration of his high office. Few, if any, mere generalities or quixotic schemes for action were suggested by him; but, on the contrary, he seemed to be master of the underlying principles of the business needs of the country as he had been of the plans of his campaigns. At a time when so many of us are disposed to put upon the statute book nostrums for relief from our industrial and financial and economic evils, it will be well for us to call to mind the striking contrast between the moderate volume and temperate character of laws enacted during his Presidency and so much of our present-day legislation of the experimental sort, reflecting often merely a view of to-day that is likely to be the heresy of tomorrow, and attempting to deal with the objectionable tendency before it is seen that it will not be arrested of itself, or before we have sufficient understanding of it to be in a position to know or apply the appropriate remedy. Accordingly the recommendations and the legislation of Washington's administration were not along guesswork lines; but the elements of soberness, patience, and wisdom which he so invariably manifested were typical of the plans he favored and adopted to bring order out of financial and industrial chaos, promote industry among the people, and restore their energies by opening up new sources of revenue and prosperity, and by assuring men that they should gather and be secure in the possession of the harvest of their labor. In all this he held true to the promise of his messages to Congress and to all his utterances and acts, and justified the expectation of the Nation—that he was to be as faithful and intelligent a servant in the work of peace as he had been amid the struggle for independence.

"While believing that free intercourse with nations would, to use his own words, promote policy, harmony, and interest, he did not part company with statesmanship, for he added:

"There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation; it is an illusion which experience must cure and which a just pride ought to discard.

COORDINATE BRANCHES OF THE GOVERNMENT TO BE HELD IN THEIR RESPECTIVE BOUNDARIES.

"There is a great need, too, for us in this day when constitutional restraint has become irksome to many, never to turn a deaf ear to the stirring appeal of Washington to his people—that the departments into which our Government is constitutionally divided shall be kept with determined hand within their respective boundaries. Speaking here not as a party man but as a citizen of the Republic, my observation and reflection have shown me how treacherously easy is the transition from centralization of government—which those of the Republican Party set so much store by and which a good many of us Democrats are inclined to acquiesce in—to a personalization of government and then to usurpation of government. Washington in all his career uttered no greater truth than when he declared that a constitutional government, under such circumstances, becomes almost, as a matter of course, a despotism. For a long time, fortunately, this was the view of the American people; and when they have departed from it a long and ominous step has been taken, not only in the commission of error but toward establishing evil precedent.

"Said he in his stately language:

"It is important, likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it, which predominates in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasions by the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes. To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

"Years afterwards Daniel Webster merely put into the matchless eloquence of his paraphrase this thought when he directed his protest at apparently so slight a departure from this principle as the proposal of the President to take from the proper Cabinet officer the right to determine upon the depository of the funds of the United States:

"It was strongly and forcibly urged yesterday by the honorable Member from South Carolina that the true and only mode of preserving any balance of power in mixed governments is to keep an exact balance. This is very true, and to this end encroachments must be resisted at the first step. The question is, therefore, whether, upon the true principles of the Constitution, this exercise of power by the President can be justified. Whether the consequences be prejudicial or not, if there be an illegal exercise of power it is to be resisted in the proper manner. Even if no harm or inconvenience results from transgressing the boundary, the intrusion is not to be suffered to pass unnoticed. Every encroachment, great or small, is important enough to awaken the attention of those who are intrusted with the preservation of a constitutional government. We are not to wait till great public mischiefs come, till the Government is overthrown, or liberty itself put into extreme jeopardy. We should not be worthy sons of our fathers were we so to regard great questions affecting the general feeling. Those fathers accomplished the Revolution on a strict question of principle. The Parliament of Great Britain asserted a right to tax the Colonies in all cases whatsoever; and it was precisely on this question that they made the Revolution turn. The amount of taxation was trifling, but the claim itself was inconsistent with liberty; and that was, in their eyes, enough. It was against the recital of an act of Parliament, rather than against any suffering under its enactments, that they took up arms. They went to war against a preamble. They fought seven years against a declaration. They poured out their treasures and their blood like water in a contest against an assertion which those less sagacious and not so well schooled in the principles of civil liberty would have regarded as barren phraseology or mere parade of words. They saw in the claim of the British Parliament a seminal attitude of mischief, the germ of unjust power; they detected it, dragged it forth from underneath its plausible disguises, struck at it; nor did it elude either their steady eye or their well-directed blow till they had extirpated it and destroyed it to the smallest fiber. On this question of principle, while actual suffering was yet afar off, they raised their flag against the power to which, for purposes of foreign contest and subrogation, Rome, in the height of her glory, is not to be compared; a power which is dotted over the surface of the whole globe with her possessions and military posts, whose morning drum beat, following the sun and keeping company with the hours, circles the earth with one continuous and unbroken strain of the martial airs of England.

"The necessity of holding strictly to the principles upon which free governments are constructed, and to those precise lines which fix the partitions of power between different branches, is as plain, if not as cogent, as that of resisting, as our fathers did, the strides of the parent country against the rights of the Colonies; because, whether the power

which exceeds its just limits be foreign or domestic, whether it be the encroachment of all branches on the rights of the people, or that of one branch on the rights of others, in either case the balanced and well-adjusted machinery of free government is disturbed, and, if the derangement go on, the whole system must fall.

CHARACTER OF WASHINGTON.

"At all times and amid all conditions Washington rang true to the note of a splendid manhood. Hypocrisy and a trafficking in expedients for popular applause no more match with his life than the crime of murder. He had little of the captivating style of speech or manner; but regard for the nobility of his character, rather than any rhetorical art or charm of personal address on his part, kept wavering lines from retreat in battle and from mutiny amid privations and suffering to which our neglect had exposed the soldiers of the Revolution. The men in the ranks and above the ranks were zealots, ready to be shot to death or starved to death or frozen to death for the sake of such an inspiring leader, even when the Colonies had forgotten to clothe and to feed them after they had carried victorious arms in this unequal contest with the greatest military power in the world. He suppressed the dissensions of the men he gathered about him for the administration of his high office, and lessened their antagonism; and, as a man of affairs and the possessor of wealth, he had so mastered essential business principles that he knew how, by encouraging manufacture and thrift and enterprise, to bind up the wounds of a people wasted and impoverished by the exhaustion of prolonged war. What a priceless possession to his countrymen is the splendid record of the achievements of such a many-sided, well-balanced, noble man.

"So all discussion of Washington ends—whether it be in the brief address or in the pages of the biographer or historian—with panegyric, and without the opportunity of the most exacting criticism to point to any conspicuous act of his which we to-day would wish to have otherwise, either for his fame or for the example of his life.

"No wonder that Webster said—

"America has furnished to the world the character of Washington. And if our American institutions had done nothing else, that alone would have entitled them to the respect of mankind.

"He stands among the great men of this country and among the great men of all countries, not only on the many pedestals of our handiwork, but on the eminence of our admiration and gratitude, as a splendid, commanding, heroic figure, the embodiment of those traits which go to make up true manhood and true greatness in the world. What Tennyson not unfairly said of Wellington can even more justly be said of Washington—that he both saved and served the State; that for him the path of duty was the way to glory, and that there should be eternal honor to his name.

PRESENT-DAY PROBLEMS OF THE REPUBLIC.

"And let us and all loyal Americans resolve that the spirit of Washington, so manifestly in the midst of us on such occasions as this, shall go with us, as with gratitude and hope renewed and loins girded about we face the future. That future will not open for us always a pleasant prospect. We shall not always be blessed with prosperous times. Corresponding to those temporary setbacks to our health wherein Nature gives her warnings whenever we are making too great a draft upon mind or body, we shall have our periodical depressions when we are imprudent in the affairs of our business life. These need not unduly concern us, for, as we come to have a stable currency and a better understanding of the economic workings of the laws of supply and demand and do not overlook some considerations which are not always in accord with the strife for mere money return, these depressions should be appreciably less and less in number and importance.

"We have, however, problems of a more serious nature confronting us for solution, and doubtless they will increase as time goes on. We, as a people, have tolerated the doing of things which must be undone or made right and not condoned; we have at times set too much store by mere material success and judged as of minor consequence things which broaden and elevate and ennoble a nation; we have made compromise with things of evil import. We have at times been unmindful of the rights of others as we have hurried on to the realization of ambitious plans, and in our indifference to the demands of good citizenship we have been guilty of or acquiesced in a course of conduct that has given rise to sullen expressions of an unrest to which we can not afford to be unconcerned listeners, for unchecked unrest is likely to breed discontent and discontent, in its turn, disorder. And unless we frankly recognize this we shall have no reasonable hope of correcting the conditions which arouse, if they do not altogether justify, those expressions, and which are a menace not only to our continuing pros-

perity but to our self-respect and our repute in the world. Again and again, as time goes on, in obedience to popular clamor, we shall be tempted to enact statutes unjust to labor or capital and not representing reflection and conviction, or statutes which are fairly certain to be incapable of enforcement and to bring the administration of the law into contempt. We shall be tempted to hesitate and temporize concerning things demanding prompt and courageous action for the public welfare. Again and again we shall stand perplexed in which direction to go when we shall have come to the crossroads of public duty and mere party expediency or even self-interest. Our way will be so shut in by doubt that we shall hesitate even as to a single step forward and upward. But there is one thing above all things to which we may cling with a certain faith, that so long as we keep with ourselves a covenant to return to and abide by the principles of Washington's Farewell Address, so long as his character shall be remembered and revered by us, so long as we shall set his life and his devotion before us as the best type and example of American citizenship to admire and emulate, this country can not falter in true progress nor in the end come short of its high mission in the world. For then, during all time to come, we shall have for our political guidance as a people the inspiration of his presence, which will be to us what for the moral guidance of men the Word of the Lord was to the psalmist of old—a lamp unto the feet and a light unto the path."

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC ROADS.

ADDRESS OF THE HON. OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD, OF ALABAMA, DELIVERED BEFORE THE AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION CONVENTION JANUARY 16, 1912.

"I thank you for the opportunity that has been given me to say a few words on a subject that is of such great importance to the American people.

"There were no wiser men, more patriotic men, that have ever been connected with this great Government of ours than the men who established it. They were enabled to look far into the future and realize that a great civilization was to grow up out of a wilderness. In establishing this Government of ours they delegated certain powers to the Federal Government and reserved the balance to the States. As to matters of local government, almost all the powers were reserved to the States, and only the necessary powers to create a central government to protect us against foreign foes, to enable us to establish a system of judiciary, and to maintain armies and navies were delegated to the Federal Government. But in their wisdom they deemed it necessary and proper to declare in the Federal Constitution that the National Government should have the power to establish post offices and post roads.

SYSTEM OF POST ROADS AUTHORIZED.

"I do not believe in the Federal Government encroaching upon the rights of the States any more than I believe in the States encroaching on the rights of the Federal Government; but I do believe that the great Central Government owes it to the people of the United States that it should enforce, carry out, and maintain the great powers of government that have been delegated to it by the States; and one of those great powers carries with it the right to see that a system of post roads for intercommunication between the people within the States and the people beyond the borders of the several States is established.

"The fathers of our Republic recognized that fact. You know as well as I do that one of the very first questions that was agitated before the Federal Congress was the building of a great post road across the continent to bind and hold the States together. They spent millions of dollars in building the Cumberland Turnpike, and we should have gone on building Federal roads throughout the United States if Watt had not invented the steam engine, and if the iron rail had not taken the place of the macadamized road. Then we abandoned Government aid to the dirt road and gave Government aid to the iron road. The great railroads that reach across this continent were built with Government aid, because they were 'establishing post roads.'

FEDERAL AID IN ROAD BUILDING.

"Now, my friends, we are coming back to the starting point. Another invention has come; the people of this country now are traveling in automobiles as well as in railroad trains. The mail, the most important single business in the United States, is being delivered at the farmer's door, instead of the farmer coming to the town and taking his mail out of the post-office box. We are coming back to the point where it is necessary again for the people of the United States to have a good system of public roads. The States have delegated the power to the Federal Government to aid in securing that system of public roads. Why did they delegate that power in the begin-

ning? Because they realized the necessity of maintaining and establishing a road system. It is the duty of the Federal Government to vitalize that power. For that reason for many years I have been in favor of the Government of the United States either establishing post roads or lending its aid to the building of post roads throughout the country. It is the only way you can build them. If the Government had gone on in the work it commenced in the early part of the last century, when it started to build the Cumberland Turnpike; if it had continued that work up to to-day, without any great burden resting on the American people, we would have had as magnificent a system of roads in the United States as you can find in any of the continental countries of Europe. But we abandoned it because we thought the railroads had come to take its place. It is far more important to the great majority of the people of the United States to have a road that carries their produce from the farm door to the railroad station and from the store in the town back to the farm door than it is to further develop a great railroad that will carry them to New York or San Francisco. The exception is the man who travels any great distance on the railroad train; it is the everyday life of the mass of the American people to travel along the dirt road from their homes to the railroad stations.

EUROPEAN HIGHWAYS.

"There is not a country in Europe that has established a system of national highways that has not done so with the aid of the central government. There were no good roads worth speaking of in England as long as they maintained the antiquated system of local taxation alone to develop a road system, and it was not until the Parliament lent aid to the building of good roads that a great system of roads was built up in England. And the same is true of France; it took national aid to establish a system of roads in France. To-day they have the greatest system of roads in the world.

COURSE OF PROCEDURE SUGGESTED.

"I know that the opposition to this argument is based on the fact that it will cost money, and I do not deny the argument. If you are going to build a great system of roads in the United States it will cost millions of money, but you can not expect to build them in a day; it will take decades to complete the work; you will never build them if you do not make the start.

"We can begin by giving national aid to assist the States, or we can commence by building several great national highways, like the Cumberland Pike, that was completed a century ago and yet remains as a monument to the wisdom of our fathers.

"As to which is the best system it is not necessary for us to determine now. The question for the people who are in favor of good roads to-day to determine is the question as to whether or not the Federal Government shall again undertake the great work, and after that is determined then you can decide as to which is the proper plan to carry out.

NECESSITY FOR A RATIONAL WORKING PLAN.

"I shall not take up your time, but I want to make just one suggestion to you in a practical way. Your association advocates one way for the building of these great highways; you find that another good-roads association advocates some other plan, and yet another association another plan. I understand that there are four great associations in this country which favor the building of national highways, and I do not believe that there are any two of them that have agreed on the same plan. Now, as long as that condition exists you are not going to build on any plan. I have this one suggestion to make to you, and it is not my own thought—it has been suggested to me by one who is wiser than I am—that instead of advocating one system to-day by this association and another system to-morrow by another association, go to the Congress of the United States and say to them, 'Appoint a joint committee to consider the building of post roads in the United States'; give them authority to hear everybody that wants to come before the committee; give them authority to find a verdict as to which is the best way to start this great national movement by proper legislation, and then you have concentrated the power in the hands of the men who in the end must exercise it; you have centralized that power where it can be used for action. They may not agree to what you want or I want, but it will be along some line that will produce results.

HANDICAP OF BAD ROADS.

"Just one word in conclusion. My friends, I remember once being on the other side of the Atlantic Ocean, and I saw a great white fleet of ships, that had traveled around the world, sailing into a foreign port, the national emblem of our great country was flying at the masthead. As they came steaming up the harbor I thanked God I was an American and felt proud that we had the greatest fleet that ever sailed around the world.

I remember once standing along the line of a railroad system in a distant country, and as I saw a train of freight cars being hauled along the track I noticed the locomotive that was pulling the cars, and it was a Baldwin locomotive, built in America, builded by our own people, carrying the commerce of the world, and I felt proud that I was an American and thanked God that I was born under the Stars and Stripes of my country. But then I went up into the mountains of Switzerland and in Italy, and I saw those magnificent turnpikes, graded roads, running up the mountain sides, smooth as this floor, guttered on the sides, carrying off every drop of water, perfectly smooth, where the people even in that mountainous country could carry their produce to market at the lowest possible outlay; then I thought of the terrible roads that I had seen in my own home State, that I had seen in almost every State of the Union, and for once, and the only time in my life, I had to bow my head with shame and could not declare that so far as our road system was concerned that I was proud of being an American citizen."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HAMILTON].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of John Eastman, late of Company H, Fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. On page 24 I continue the case. The report says:

It appears from the proof filed in the case that the claimant was first married in Massachusetts on August 14, 1850, to one Ivory G. Phillips—

And that she was never divorced. Now, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE] is not discussing the paragraph under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the five-minute rule a Member must confine himself to the paragraph read. The Chair holds that the point of order is well taken.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I will leave that discussion, then. The discussion on the floor of this House to-day shows to every man present the laxity of the committee in reporting bills—

Mr. ANSBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The gentleman must confine himself to the paragraph just read.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. The Chairman having ruled upon the question—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE] is recognized.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I simply wish to ask a question. No such rule as this has been invoked in this House before. If the name of John Smith were not mentioned in a paragraph, we can not mention the name of John Smith?

The CHAIRMAN. The rule of the House is that under the five-minute rule a Member must confine himself to the subject of the amendment offered. That has always been the rule of the House. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of John F. Rankin, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. I move to strike out the words "thirty-six dollars," in line 11.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 11, strike out the word "thirty-six."

Mr. RODDENBERRY. I ask the attention of the author of the bill, or the chairman of the subcommittee, to the fact that it appears in this case that John F. Rankin is 71 years old, and served as a musician in Company C, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, two years and seven months; that he is now a pensioner at \$22 a month on account of slight deafness. The medical testimony shows that the applicant has a small, rough, and hilly farm, which he rents, and that his small income from this source and his pension constitute his sole support. It is recommended that he be allowed an increase to \$36. Now, mark you, here is a musician, owning a little farm and having a small income, and we have just passed an item where another soldier was 71 years of age, served three years, not as a musician, but as a fighter and a soldier, has no property at all, suffers from divers and sundry afflictions, and the proposition is to give him \$24 a month. What I would like the gentleman to explain is why the soldier who served three years and fought, and who has no property, who is absolutely helpless, gets \$24, and the horn tooter, who is now getting \$22 and has a farm, gets \$36. And there is deep silence upon the face of the waters.

Mr. AUSTIN. When the gentleman concludes his remarks I will reply to him.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. I have no criticism of the particular claim. I am asking now why the discrepancy, why the discrimination, and why the partiality? Now, gentlemen, I recognize that in a multitude of measures you can not have absolute uniformity. I likewise recognize that there may be some good reason why the hornblower should have \$36, and why the musket bearer should have \$24, although the musket bearer walks no longer save upon crutches, and has no rough hillside to give him a resting place. But why do not you show it? But the hornblower? How about him? The report should show some information before you should expect enlightened men to vote for it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. RUSSELL. May I ask the gentleman from Georgia a question?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. To what two cases does the gentleman refer? The Rolain case?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. That, and the one relating to John Mulligan, on page 4 of the report, the last item on the page. I will now ask my friend to explain that case. He is getting \$24. The report does not show whose bill it is, but when you go back home, whoever is the author of the bill, you tell that old soldier why you could not get the \$24 for a fighter, while somebody else got \$36 for a hornblower.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Just a word, Mr. Chairman. I think I can explain it to the gentleman. I just want one moment, Mr. Chairman, a word on behalf of the committee, because I feel that the committee is more or less arraigned in every one of these assaults upon this bill.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. I do not mean to arraign the committee. I am arraigning the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I want to show, Mr. Chairman, the reason which the gentleman has not discovered in these cases. John Mulligan, to whose case the gentleman refers, is about of the same age as John F. Rankin. Mulligan is 71 years of age, and Rankin is 71 years of age. Both served about the same length of time. Mulligan's injuries did not result from his service. He is drawing a pension under the age law, while Rankin is drawing a pension because of injuries from which he now suffers, resulting from his service in the Army. That is a distinction that has been recognized, both in the Bureau of Pensions and in the Committee on Invalid Pensions and by this House. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, line 11, strike out the word "thirty-six."

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RODDENBERRY] demanded an explanation from either the gentleman having this bill in charge or from the author of this item carried in the bill. It gives me pleasure to say to the gentleman that I am the author of the bill to increase the pension of John F. Rankin, a man whom I have favorably known for perhaps 20 years. While I do not hope to satisfy the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RODDENBERRY], or the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY], who seem to be absolutely reckless and unwilling to believe that the pension roll is a roll of honor, yet there are Members on the floor of this House to whom I wish to speak in reference to the merits of this particular case.

This man, as the record and report show, is more than 70 years of age. He rendered faithful service in the Union Army for almost three years, enlisting from one of the East Tennessee regiments, raised right in the heart of the Southern Confederacy, where it cost something to be loyal to the Union. Mr. Rankin is a poor man, honest, worthy, and deserving, and the medical testimony in his case shows that his disabilities are not single, but triple, and that owing to the nature and character of the disabilities from which he suffers he is precluded from making a living by manual labor.

Something has been said about the particular service that he rendered, namely, that he was a musician. Those were two years and seven months of faithful service for your country, and for my country. It often required music to enthrall and rally the boys under the Stars and Stripes, and it took music to rally the boys under the stars and bars. That magic music—Dixie—carried many boys into the Southern Confederacy, under the southern flag.

But the man who left his home to fight for the flag of the Union and the man who left his home for the Southern Confederacy both displayed heroic courage, whether he was a

musician or an officer or a private, and I believe that justice reigns in the breast of men in this House, regardless of which side of this Chamber they sit upon. [Applause.] I despise and hold in utter contempt this constant arraigning and abusing the Union soldiers in this House and in certain publications, and this constant challenging of the motives and intentions of my colleagues in favorably reporting and voting for these bills, and I resent it. My colleagues upon this side and upon that side are performing their duty under their oaths just as well as the Member from Georgia [Mr. RODDENBERRY] and the Member from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY]. My worthy colleagues on this side and upon that side have the honor and the glory of our common country at heart, and ill does it become the gentleman from Georgia or the gentleman from Texas to impugn the honor and the patriotism of their action in this House. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, line 11, strike out the word "thirty-six."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Ward L. Roach, late of Company B, Second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the word "twenty-four," in line 19, page 3.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, line 19, strike out the word "twenty-four."

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I take this paragraph up because I feel very much encouraged that gentlemen who are the authors of bills, for the first time in two years since I have been a Member of this House, venture to rise and tell the merits of their case.

Here is a man, Ward L. Roach, 73 years old, a private in his company, who has been drawing a pension for many years. At the same time he is a justice of the peace. He has an income from his office as justice of the peace—a minimum of \$200 a year—and his present pension is \$180 a year. The committee recommend that he be given \$24 a month.

We have just passed an item which gives a pension of \$20 to the widow of a Union soldier, which widow married the soldier during the war, and is old and feeble and is charged with the support and maintenance of an infirm mother. I would like to have the author of the bill or some member of the committee explain why it is that it is just to give a man who is a justice of the peace, so possessed of his faculties, so physically incapacitated that he can preside in that capacity and earn \$200 a year at the minimum, an increase of pension from \$180 a year to \$288 a year, while you only give to the widow of this soldier who fought, who is helpless and dependent, and who, in the language of the report, is a war widow, old and penniless, without resources, but \$20 a month? I want to know what explanation the author of this bill will give to this old widow and to his constituents, when she in her distress, her poverty, and her dire condition gets but \$20 a month, while right on the same page a vital, living judge, a justice of the peace, getting \$200 a year for his services and \$180 a year pension, gets an increase to \$24 a month? Gentlemen, you may not undertake to explain satisfactorily to me, and the inquiry I make may meet with your silence, but God spare you when the wrath of your constituents meets you at the next election.

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. RODDENBERRY. I yield my time to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio. I am glad the gentleman from Georgia has found one claim where he approves of the committee's action, when he stated that this poor widow is entitled to \$20 a month.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. You ought to make it \$30.

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio. Would you vote for it?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. I will vote for it.

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Joseph C. McGarrah, late of Company B, Sixty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph. There are very many of these items to which I should be glad to address myself, but I am absolutely unable physically to continue at great length on these different items. Therefore I leave it to such gentlemen around me as may want these matters investigated to pursue the subject.

Mr. TRIBBLE. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Does it not occur to the gentleman that he is the only one that can get the floor on this side of the House?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. I can not accede entirely to the views of my colleague.

Mr. AUSTIN. I suggest that the gentleman yield to his colleague.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Here is a pensioner 71 years old who has been drawing a pension for years and years, and the committee, with the hand of favoritism, with the mighty power of an unrestrained and well-nigh unresistant majority, propose to give this soldier, 71 years of age, \$36 a month, when the very item before it is for an old, decrepit, infirm man, with long service in the Army, now tottering under the weight of 79 years, who gets but \$30 a month. There is written into this bill discrimination, favoritism, partiality, and pull—I do not know whether it is political pull or patriotic pull—which enables one man to get \$36 when he is only 71 years of age and this poor old man, 79 years old, with the heavy weight of years resting upon him, gets only \$30. When he gets only \$30 the pensioner next below him in this bill, no more infirm, no more patriotic, no more valiant, gets \$36 a month. I want the author of the bill, who acquiesces in the finding of the committee, to explain why it is that his constituent gets only \$30, when he is high onto 80 years of age, while on the same page another man draws \$36, when he is not as old and is no more infirm. If you do not answer here, you can not escape explaining when you go home. You will not answer me, but when you go home answer your constituent, his sons, and his grandsons, and his kindred throughout the bailiwick.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. As I read it, it only provides for \$30 in the bill.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. On the top of page 11, \$30 is recommended, so the report says.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. Then I do not understand the gentleman.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. All of which goes to show that the chairman of the committee himself, the way this legislation is ramrodded through, does not know which bill he is voting on, I tell you it is unjust legislation; it is not intelligent legislation, it is not fair legislation when a man of ability, a man of skill, a man of learning, a member of the committee investigating a claim stands here and does not know what pension he is voting on. But it is no reflection on him. It is the iniquitous railroad system.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. I wanted to know what paragraph the gentleman indicated.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. This is roughshod, ill-digested, legislation that the powerful majority rushes through over a helpless colleague who is able only to make a few more objections. [Laughter.]

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. What line and page was the gentleman's amendment offered to. I was unable to hear.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment again.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 17, strike out the paragraph consisting of lines 17, 18, 19, and 20.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken, and the amendment was lost.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose, and Mr. BARTLETT having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 4151) to authorize the Minnesota & International Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Bemidji, in the State of Minnesota.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 339) providing for the reappraisal and sale of certain lands in the town site of Port Angeles, Wash., and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 4238) to provide for the use of the American National Red Cross in aid of the land and naval forces in time of actual or threatened war.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

Senate concurrent resolution 18.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be requested to make a supplemental or additional report or estimate concerning the work of levee construction in the improvement of the navigability of the Mississippi River on the east bank thereof, from Vicksburg to Bayou Sara, for use in connection with S. 4353, being a bill to aid in construction of levees and embankments on the east side of the Mississippi River.

PENSIONS.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Henry Meerdink, late of Company D, Thirty-fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I say, sir, that the spectacle we have seen here to-day on the floor of this House, it seems to me, should convince everyone that the methods that have been adopted in the past and the methods adopted at the present time by this committee are lax, and that the country will not stand for it.

Mr. ANSBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not talking to the amendment.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I am talking about this case.

Mr. ANSBERRY. The gentleman is not speaking to his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order and the gentleman will proceed.

Mr. ANSBERRY. I make the point of order that the gentleman can not proceed unless he proceeds in order.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I will give notice that the gentleman will not save any time by that point of order. I will be here all the time, during this session and the next, and I may be here in other days, perhaps, in future sessions; and I should not be surprised that some of you will be at home when I am here. I am not afraid of my pension stand. I have not attempted to criticize anybody in my entire discussion of the pension legislation. If you take my first speech of December 9 and read it—

Mr. ANSBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman should proceed in order.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I put the gentleman on notice that he will save no time by his gag rule that he is invoking from the Chair.

Mr. ANSBERRY. The gentleman only shows his lack of knowledge of the rules by calling it a gag rule.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Now, Mr. Chairman, they ask in this paragraph to extend the pension to a woman whom the gentleman from Missouri, Gov. RUBEY, says bears a good record.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RUBEY. What paragraph is being discussed?

Mr. TRIBBLE. Page 24 of the report.

Mr. RUBEY. But we are not passing the report.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I beg the gentleman's pardon, this is not the case of the gentleman from Missouri. In the case before the House they propose to pay a pension to a woman who never obtained a divorce from a previous husband. I notice throughout this report of the committee, and if gentlemen will read it they will see, that they quote from Members of Congress. They say in their findings that Congressman So-and-so made certain statements in regard to such and such a party. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that it is not a fair investigation by the committee. If the Congressmen want their testimony to go in this record then it ought to be put here in affidavit form and not in the way it is. I challenge gentlemen to read the report through from one end to the other, and if they do they will find frequent occurrences of Congressmen's statements. They would not be received in any court in this land as testimony.

Mr. RUBEY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TRIBBLE. I will.

Mr. RUBEY. Would the gentleman take a statement made by one of his colleagues and place in it as much credence as he would in his sworn affidavit?

Mr. TRIBBLE. There is not a colleague in this Congress whose statement I would not take.

Mr. RUBEY. Then, why does the gentleman want his affidavit?

Mr. TRIBBLE. There is not a court in this country that would take a Congressman's statement, even though he holds the distinction of being a Congressman, without his putting it in legal form, and all I am asking for is legal form, and I have the right to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The testimony in this report is made not for a court, but it is made for the information of Members of this House.

Mr. TRIBBLE. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. RUBEY. Yes.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Is it not a fact that for 50 years this pension legislation, both special and general, has gone through this House, and not a man, until the present session, has raised his voice to contest a single case?

Mr. RUBEY. Unfortunately for me, I will say that I—

Mr. TRIBBLE. Then, is the gentleman passing on pensions as a court, or is he just throwing down the bars and letting everybody come in without even allowing a Member of Congress to contest or investigate?

Mr. RUBEY. Is that a question or a speech?

Mr. TRIBBLE. The gentleman can take it as he pleases.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, replying to that, I will say that, unfortunately for me, I have not been a Member of Congress during the last 50 years, but the records of this Congress show that during the preceding two years there were passed through this Congress over 9,000 private pension bills in a Republican Congress, and during that time not a Democrat from Georgia or from any other Southern State got up here and tried to prohibit it or tried to delay Congress in passing these bills; but the moment we get into control, the moment the Democrats get into the majority and try to do the right thing for the old soldier, we have men on our own side of the House—only two or three—who are trying to obstruct legislation, who are trying to do these things, not for the general good of the whole country but for the purpose of sending back home some speeches that will help them in their respective districts. [Applause.]

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUBEY. Yes.

Mr. TRIBBLE. The gentleman says that I am making no effort, and the other gentleman from Georgia is making no effort, for the good of the people we represent. I ask the gentleman if this Democratic Congress has not gone along here and refused to appropriate anything for public buildings; if it has not refused to appropriate anything for battleships, the defense of our homes; and I ask the gentleman if it has not gone along here and cut down, section after section, the agricultural bill, taking from the farmer that which should go to him in order that this pension legislation should be paid? The gentleman's charge is not sustained by the facts. The people of my district and the country at large appreciate the sincerity of this fight.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Georgia will give us an opportunity to legislate, before this Congress adjourns we will do the things that the people of this country want done and leave undone the things that they do not want done.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I will ask the gentleman another question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. RUBEY. Certainly.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Have not gentlemen had the opportunity right here on the floor of the House, and is not the agricultural bill grinding along day after day right now, and do not the gentlemen come in here and join forces and cut down the agricultural bill in order that gentlemen may pay the pensions that they are asking for their districts?

Mr. RUBEY. No; absolutely we do not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, I have heard a good deal of discussion to-day on pension matters. I have heard the two gentlemen from Georgia [Mr. RODDENBERRY and Mr. TRIBBLE] talk about patriotism and love of the old soldier. I have heard them declare time and time again that they believe in pensioning the worthy soldier, and during all of this discussion they have shown a disposition not to be satisfied with the report of one of the great committees of this House upon the very thing they claim to be so patriotically in favor of; and they manifest more bravery and more patriotism when they can attack a bill that comes here proposing to put a poor old woman, the widow of two soldiers, on the pension list than they do in attacking the pension of a soldier—

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOWARD. I make the point of order that the gentleman from Missouri is not confining his argument to the section under discussion.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Georgia will withdraw that objection.

Mr. HOWARD. I will not do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained and the gentleman from Missouri will proceed in order.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is entirely within his rights.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri will proceed in order.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE] objects to a pension being paid to the widow of an old soldier, and I was talking about the bravery of men who can attack the report of the committee when it proposes to pension the widow of a soldier who served his country long and well at the front.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. BOOHER. No. I have heard these gentlemen say that we may go back to our districts, and when we hear from the people back there, there will be vacant seats on this side of the Chamber. I want to say to the gentlemen that they may go back to my district in Missouri, and if they will go out in the open and attack the reputation and the character of the widow of an old soldier, when the committee has reported in favor of her, the good women of my district will drum them out of the country; and if they have the same kind of women in the South, as I know they have, they would receive the same treatment there. [Applause.] Why, the great State of Missouri sustains a Confederate soldiers' home by taxation. She sustains a Union soldiers' home by taxation, and a Republican member of the legislature of that State introduced a bill taking over the Confederate Soldiers' Home as a State institution. We tried to sustain it by popular subscription, but the burden became too great, and without a dissenting vote in the legislature it was taken over as a State institution. [Applause.] We are threatened now that if we vote to give a pension to some poor old widow woman of \$12 a month that this Government is going to sink beneath the weight which that pension will place upon the backs of the people. I am willing to take my share of the responsibility. [Applause.] I have a brother who lies buried over there in the soil of Virginia. He died in defense of the flag we love so well. I am speaking from that point of view, and I say to my friends from Georgia that they are mistaken in the patriotism of the people of this country. [Applause.] You are mistaken when you try to compel this House to believe against your better judgment that this kind of conduct will meet the approval of even your own constituents. I know it will not meet the approval of the people that I represent here and a vast majority of the people whom the Members of this House represent. I believe in private pension bills. I believe in them more than I did in the Sherwood bill when I voted for it.

I believe the way to help the needy cases, to help the old men and old women who need support in their last days, is through private pension bills, and I am glad that the Democratic members of the Committee on Invalid Pensions are not behind the Republican Committee on Invalid Pensions in taking care of these old soldiers. [Applause.] We can go back to our people and say that we have maintained the record of taking care of the needy and dependent soldiers and their widows; and that is the way the people look at this matter. I am not talking from a sentimental standpoint, but from the standpoint of doing right by these old men and women.

The gentlemen from Georgia have the undisputed right to oppose the granting of pension of every kind, and no one questions their right to do so. But to assail the reputation of this old widow requires neither the exhibition of courage or patriotism, and I can not help but think my friends are making a very grave mistake.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, for the purpose of making an observation in reply to a statement of the gentleman from Georgia, who reproached us for not introducing a river and harbor bill and a public buildings bill in this House.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I said nothing about rivers and harbors bill.

Mr. CLINE. Do not take up my time. I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Georgia to what this Congress has done for Georgia in the last five years. It has paid into the Public Treasury internal revenue estimated at \$2,325,000. They have taken back in river and harbor improvements \$2,632,000. There has been paid to the citizens of Georgia by the Federal Government in pensions \$2,116,000, and now we are just erecting and completing 30 buildings in 30 cities of the State of Georgia at a cost of \$4,000,000. [Applause.]

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOWARD. I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing the paragraph of the bill under consideration. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana will proceed in order.

Mr. CLINE. I will do so, with pleasure.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I insist upon the point of order if the gentleman will not allow me to ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. CLINE. Not at the present time. Mr. Chairman, for every dollar that the State of Georgia has paid into the public Treasury of the United States they have taken out nearly \$5.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOWARD. That the gentleman is not discussing the paragraph of the bill that is under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana will proceed in order.

Mr. HOWARD. And that his argument is not germane.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TRIBBLE. The Chairman instructed me that I was out of order, and I call upon the Chair to pass upon the question of whether the gentleman is now out of order.

I do not propose for the gentleman to assail my State, and not be heard from, if that is the purpose of the gentleman.

Mr. CLINE. I am just referring to the bare question and making answer to the very proposition the gentleman invoked.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of the gentleman. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. CLINE. For every dollar expended—

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The House will be in order. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE] has expired. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, may I be allowed to extend my remarks in the RECORD on this point?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. EDWARDS. Reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed in order, to finish his remarks, for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. EDWARDS] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE] may be allowed to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HARDWICK. I do not believe that my friend from Indiana [Mr. CLINE] intends to make an assault on the State of Georgia here to-day.

Mr. CLINE. Oh, no; I have no such purpose and have made no assault. I am just answering the gentleman.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order I ought to have the right to answer the gentleman. The Chair will not allow me to discuss those questions. I propose to answer the gentleman if he assails my State.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE] is recognized for five minutes. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK]?

Mr. CLINE. I do not want to violate the rules of the House. If the gentleman insists on the point of order, I will take my seat.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the gentleman yield for just a moment?

Mr. CLINE. Certainly.

Mr. HARDWICK. I did not understand that my friend was assailing the State of Georgia.

Mr. CLINE. Bless you, I want Georgia to get everything she can get for rivers and harbors and public buildings, but I do not want her to come back and take the well-earned support from the old soldiers who spent four years to teach the State that it was wrong and bring her back into the Union.

Mr. HARDWICK. I want to thank the gentleman in behalf of the delegation from Georgia for the very splendid tribute he has paid to the members of that delegation for the efficiency and zeal with which they serve their constituents. I want to thank the gentleman also because in all of these things we have received he has helped us to get the appropriation.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is not proceeding in order, and I ask that the gentleman from Indiana may proceed for five minutes with general debate, and that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE] be permitted to answer in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to have printed and inserted in the RECORD, in connection with the section under discussion—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. MANN. I ask that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE] may be permitted to proceed in general debate for five minutes, and that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE] be permitted to answer in five minutes.

Mr. ANSBERRY. To that I object.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph. In the consideration, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, of this very important paragraph I desire to say by way of kind reply to my friend from Missouri [Mr. BOOHER] that neither of the gentlemen from Georgia made any reference to the widow of the soldier which can not be found in the exact language of the report of the committee, the report itself showing that this widow "took up with" a man. We only quoted the report. I want to say to my friend, now, from Indiana [Mr. CLINE] that we are glad to have the report as to what is transpiring in the State of Georgia, but I will also admonish him that we do not advocate giving one appropriation in order to get another.

Mr. ANSBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not addressing himself to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to proceed deliberately and in order and say that under this section, which provides an appropriation and deals with the amount of pensions that go to the various sections of the country, although it may be true, as stated, that the disposition of these pensions and other appropriations are not in exact balance, yet if it were not for the balance of trade of \$200,000,000 that comes from the South in the way of the cotton product we would have a panic in this country—

Mr. ANSBERRY. I make the point of order.

Mr. RODDENBERRY (continuing). That Morgan, Guggenheim, and all the rest of them could never stop.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ANSBERRY] makes a point of order.

Mr. ANSBERRY. The gentleman is not proceeding in order.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Relating to this item in this paragraph, which I move to strike out, Mr. Chairman, I desire to say it adds a tax equally on every citizen of the country, and the great southern country that maintains the balance of trade in favor of this Government is willing to pay its just and full proportion for its soldiers, and, if necessary, we will increase the amount of any item that deserves it.

Mr. ANSBERRY. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio will state his point of order.

Mr. ANSBERRY. My point of order is that the gentleman is not proceeding in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will confine himself to the motion and proceed in order.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am proceeding in order in the discussion of this paragraph, inasmuch as it deals with a public expenditure. I welcome it if it is a deserving case. We can afford it, considering our vast resources, our vast commerce, including our vast exportation of that commodity which keeps the balance of trade in our favor. We will bear all the burdens of the country with you and ask no favors, and will do justice to every single interest of this country.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to include in this discussion the report in this case.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE] asks unanimous consent to insert the report in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. ANSBERRY. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the motion to strike out the section.

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Belle A. Corbin, widow of John A. Corbin, late of Company G, Ninety-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I rise to inquire if this case, which is mentioned on page 75 of the report, comes within the rule of the committee? We have had a good deal of trouble to-day to find out what the rules of the committee are. The Members of the House no doubt observed the fact that one member of the committee got up here and in vigorous language spoke about his integrity having been impugned because it was charged that there are no written rules, that the committee has no written rules, and

then, another Member brings forth the rules and shows to the members of the committee in the presence of the House written rules on certain questions. I would like to know if this case comes within the rules, if they have any. I state emphatically that the law is against this claim, and challenge denial.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. What claim is it?

Mr. TRIBBLE. It is mentioned on page 75.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. It is at the bottom of page 30 of the bill.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, Belle A. Corbin was the wife of a soldier, and as the wife of a soldier, who has pensionable right, under the laws of the United States, she has a right to draw a pension. But, Mr. Chairman, she married again, and she surrendered her right to a pension. After she had lived with the man whom she married the second time she decided that she would rather have a pension than the man, and she deserted him, secured a divorce, and now comes in here and asks this committee to grant her a pension, and they give it to her. Now, is that within the law? It is against the law and the statutes of the United States, and you gentlemen must know it, although it may be within the rules prescribed by the gentlemen of this committee, but your rules are not law. I am calling for the enforcement of the law.

Now, I think that I have a right to know, Mr. Chairman, and the right to investigate, when these cases come before this House, and ascertain whether or not the committee is acting within the spirit of the law and within the letter of the law. Why, we have been criticized by gentlemen here, who refer to the gentleman from Georgia as being the first ever to rise and undertake to obstruct legislation for pensions in this House. In the name of God, is it not time for some man to have the nerve and the manhood to get up and contest such claims as are brought before this House some time or other?

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn. [Cries of "Read!" "Read!"] The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of William F. Marshall, late of Company I, Thirty-sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph, for the purpose of calling the gentleman's attention to a certain matter. I shall not detain the committee unduly.

Mr. RUSSELL. What is the name of that case?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. It is on page 31, line 12. I will not detain the committee; but I think the attention of the committee and of the House ought to be called to this fact: Here is the name of William F. Marshall, a soldier, and if you will look at the committee report you will see that there is a lack of uniformity in the rates. He gets \$40 a month, and just before it there is a widow. She is given only \$12 a month. I can not understand why a widow is not just as dependent and just as helpless as a man and why she should get only \$12 a month and he should get \$40 a month. And just before that there is a soldier, and he is given \$50 a month. It presents this situation:

Here is a Congressman's soldier who gets \$50, while another gets \$12; and here is a widow who gets \$12, and another gets \$30. It does seem to me that in the careful, painstaking wisdom of the committee there ought to be some remedy for that. I am not seeking to delay the committee or to make a vexatious objection.

Mr. RUSSELL. I know the gentleman is asking the question in good faith. Now, does not the gentleman from Georgia know that it is the policy of Congress and of the Pension Department, and always has been—whether right or wrong, I do not now assume to say—not to pay widows of soldiers as much as the soldiers themselves who did the fighting are paid?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. That is quite true.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is all there is in that point.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. But does not the gentleman think it would be more equitable, more just, and more patriotic to take a bill like this, with all its variations from \$12 to \$50 a month, and recommit it and let a proposition come in to equalize the items and give all soldiers \$24 or \$30 a month and all widows \$20 or \$24 a month? Does not that look as though it would be reasonable? It seems to me that the natural sense of equity, justice, and fairness of that proposition would cause it to address itself with future and present favor to the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Georgia vote for a bill like that?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. I would be glad to recommit the bill with instructions to the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. That does not answer my question. Would the gentleman vote to pay all soldiers \$24 or \$30 a month and

all widows \$20 a month? Would the gentleman vote for a bill like that?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. If I get the opportunity I will move to recommit the bill with instructions to the committee to report immediately \$24 a month for all soldiers and \$20 a month for all widows in this bill; and if you will permit it to be recommitted and reported to the House I will vote for it, because it will save the country many thousands of dollars over the present provisions of the bill and be more equitable.

Mr. RUSSELL. That was the nature of the Sherwood bill, so far as the soldiers were concerned. Did the gentleman vote for that bill?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. No; I did not, but that bill covered the cases of people worth \$100,000 apiece. They ought not to be pensioned.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think not myself. I agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. The gentleman and I agree. Then, there was in that bill a provision that a soldier in a soldiers' home might draw \$30 a month. That was not fair. There were other insurmountable objections.

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio. The gentleman says he would like to recommit the bill and give all soldiers \$24 or \$30 per month. Will not the gentleman take into consideration a soldier who has reached the age of 62 years as against the case of a soldier who is 80 years old, as this old soldier is at the present time? Will the gentleman not take into consideration a soldier who served 90 days as against a soldier who served over 4 years? Will he pension all soldiers alike, regardless of age, service, or disability?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. No. I would draft a bill covering soldiers—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

The question being taken on the motion to strike out the paragraph, it was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Albert Barfield, alias Albert Pound, late of Company C, Twenty-fourth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. ANSBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out "twenty-four," in line 19, and to insert in lieu thereof "thirty." I desire to call the attention of the committee to the fact that this man, evidently a colored soldier, is suffering from curvature of the spine, partial paralysis, and total blindness. In my opinion he should be paid \$30 a month.

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio. Which one is it?

Mr. ANSBERRY. Albert Barfield, on page 31, line 16. On this particular proposition I am quite in line with my patriotic friend from Georgia [Mr. RODDENBERRY], who has done so much this afternoon to point out errors in the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIBBLE. Certainly.

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio. I would like to advise my colleague that it has been the practice of the committee not to grant an increase exceeding \$24 where the soldier served less than a year. While I would vote for the increase in this case to \$30, or in all similar cases, it is against the practice of the committee.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say this in regard to the gentleman's amendment: This fight on special pensions started principally on the motion of a gentleman on the other side over there to increase a pension on the floor of the House from \$25 to \$70. To this I have called attention in previous remarks. The attention of the country was called to that particular fact. I have been assured by members of this committee to-day that no more Members will be allowed on the floor of the House to increase a pension without carrying it back to the committee and have the committee act on it first.

Mr. ANSBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw the amendment. I only wanted to test the gentleman's patriotism.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph. So far as this gentleman from Georgia is concerned, so long as I am a Member of Congress, I will not willfully, knowingly, and deliberately vote to give a nigger \$24 or \$30 and the widow of a white soldier only \$12—never.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia to strike out the section.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Edward B. North, late of Company G, Ninety-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word to see if we can get some information in the committee

as to what the committee is going to do. May I respectfully inquire of the two gentlemen from Georgia, Mr. RODDENBERRY and Mr. TRIBBLE, whether they have a number of other paragraphs in the bill which they desire to discuss?

Mr. TRIBBLE. Answering for myself, I will say that I have several.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Unless matters arise in the future unexpectedly, I have only two. There are a number I would like to address myself to, but I am physically unable to do so. There are, however, two others that I do desire five minutes in which to call attention of the members of the subcommittee and the Members of the House to inconsistencies.

Mr. MANN. May I further inquire if it is the gentleman's intention to make a motion to recommit?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. It is.

Mr. MANN. And does the gentleman intend to insist on a quorum?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, it is very important to have a quorum here on this legislation.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will indulge me, it seems to me it would be wise for the committee to rise. It is very evident that there is only one or two ways in which these private pension bills can be passed. One would be by a rule such as was brought in two weeks ago; another would be by a rule which would authorize the Speaker to recognize a member of the committee to make a motion for suspension of the rules to pass the bill. I should think likely, if the opposition is to be continued, that in the state we are in, as far as the business of the House is concerned, the House would be justified in agreeing to a rule which would authorize the Speaker on Fridays to recognize a Member for a motion to suspend the rules and pass the private pension bill. If that is to be the case and we are to have that or some other such method it might as well be applied to this bill at another session as to sit here for several hours to-night and then not be able to pass it. It is perfectly manifest that the House can not get a quorum to-night.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. May I inquire with reference to the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, if there is any rule of the House now that prevents a motion to suspend the rules on Monday, on suspension day?

Mr. MANN. There is no rule of the House, but with the exception of the war claims bill, which in the last Congress was passed under a motion to suspend the rules, the Speaker has never heretofore recognized a Member for a motion to suspend the rules to pass a private bill.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. I have no doubt that the gentleman from Pennsylvania could assist the gentleman of the Rules Committee on this side in the preparation of such a rule.

Mr. MANN. It would not require the ingenuity of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Any gentleman who has been in the House for two or three terms, who has seen a large share of the legislation of Congress pass through the House under motion to suspend the rules, without which Congress would be soon tied up on legislation so that it could not extricate itself, would readily recognize the fact that a large share of the business is passed under suspension of the rules, and would readily suggest that that would be the proper way to make a motion to pass a bill which two-thirds of the House desires to pass after short discussion.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I was altogether of the opinion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], that without any assistance we on this side could prepare rules of this sort, until it was brought to my attention two weeks ago that recourse was had to the great learning and ability of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], and he safely guided us through into the land of gadom.

Mr. LAMB. Oh, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, having been long a member of the majority of the House that did business, that passed more good legislation than any other legislative body in the same length of time, knows how it is done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, what is before the House?

The CHAIRMAN. Nothing. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of James D. Burcham, late of Company E, Sixth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, is it in order at this stage to suggest the absence of a quorum?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. One hundred and sixteen Members present, a quorum.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Chair count again. I am not willing to have the Chair guess at what is a quorum in this committee under any circumstance.

The CHAIRMAN (after counting). One hundred and eighty-eight Members present. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Joseph Carter, jr., late of Company B, Tenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia that the committee do now rise.

The question was taken, and on a division, demanded by Mr. RODDENBERRY, there were—ayes 24, noes 70.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. All those in favor of ordering tellers will rise and stand until counted.

Mr. ELLERBE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ELLERBE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia on my left [Mr. TRIBBLE] makes the point that there is no quorum present. After he had done that, the gentleman from Georgia on my right [Mr. RODDENBERRY], who has been very silent to-day, demanded tellers. I ask now if it is not, first, the proper thing to do for the Chair to decide the point of no quorum?

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order that there is no quorum present. I insist that the division disclosed the fact of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that point of order is dilatory.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has just counted a quorum.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, when the Chair counted it again on a division, the absence of a quorum was disclosed.

The CHAIRMAN. The number of those who stood up on the division did not constitute a quorum, but a number of gentlemen did not stand up. There was a quorum present. Those in favor of ordering tellers will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Twelve gentlemen, not a sufficient number, and tellers are refused, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Frederick Markgraf, late of Company F, Sixty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. From what page is the Clerk reading?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk is reading from page 35.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, is it in order for the Chair to ascertain if the Clerk made a mistake and skipped page 34?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair presumes that the Clerk has read consecutively. The Clerk will proceed with the reading.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of David Gilchrist, late of Company B, Thirty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. We come now to the item of Nancy Gaven, on line 21, page 36 of the bill. I find, on referring to the report, that the officers of the church federation of charity of Lebanon, Mo., in pleading for the restoration of this woman's name to the pension roll, believe in her good faith, so they say. Mr. Chairman, on the floor of the House to-day you have been told in eloquent language by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY] that this woman has been a pauper on the town of Lebanon. You have had a description of a pitiful scene which was enacted before him before he left his home. So deplorable is the condition of this woman and her family that the church federation at Lebanon, Mo., has for years and years and years, according to the statement of the gentleman from Missouri, had her in charge and supported her and her family as paupers.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIBBLE. Yes.

Mr. RUBEY. I say to the gentleman that he is absolutely mistaken.

Mr. TRIBBLE. What did the gentleman say?

Mr. RUBEY. In my remarks I did not use the word "pauper" at all.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Will the gentleman repeat what he said?

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, I am not going into a discussion of that matter at all. When the gentleman gets through with his remarks let us go on and finish the bill. I have made my speech before this House, and I am willing to stand by it. [Applause.]

Mr. TRIBBLE. I withdraw the word "pauper," Mr. Chairman, and I will substitute for it the word "dependent"—that

she was dependent on the people of Lebanon and the church federation.

I want to say to you that I think it is getting to be a pretty severe hardship when the people of Georgia, to whom they refer, are not only called upon to carry the pension list of some of the Western States, but to carry on that list the dependent paupers who are not entitled to pensions. Now, Mr. Chairman, what are the facts? I weigh well my words, and I do not mean to criticize the committee, but I say they have not investigated these cases. These cases, I presume, come up in the committee room as they usually do in committee rooms, and the members of the committee are busy. They have passed up to this time about 600 cases. The gentleman can not get up on the floor of this House and say that they have inspected and passed upon the claims of these pensioners by personal investigation. Therefore I am not criticizing the committee. I have never in any of my pension speeches or remarks on the floor of this House criticized any man or set of men. You can read my speeches from the beginning, and you will find that that is true. What are the facts of this case? I will give them.

The husband, according to the report of the committee, A. J. Moore, died on March 19, 1865. Listen Mr. Chairman. This does not come from the mouth of my friend from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY]. I know he is an honest man, if there is an honest man on the floor of this House. He is my friend, and I love him; but these words do not come from him. But these words go to the country, and the country stands upon this record; and what does the record say. It says:

Shortly thereafter Nancy took up with Gaven, also a soldier, and, having become a Catholic, married him by ceremony February 15, 1878.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Now, there is the record.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Mary E. Martin, widow of George G. Martin, late Lieutenant colonel First Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Now, I want to conclude my remarks as to Nancy Gaven.

Mr. ANSBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that he can not conclude his remarks concerning this person while we are on another item.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia will proceed.

Mr. ANSBERRY. He wants to talk about a case which we have passed.

Mr. TRIBBLE. If the House—

Mr. ANSBERRY. I did not want you to discuss a paragraph which has been passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE] may proceed in order.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I respectfully submit it has been stated on the floor of this House here to-day that the committee had no disposition in the world to shut out the light of truth.

Mr. ANSBERRY. I am still of that opinion, but I do not regard the gentleman as the light of truth by any means.

Mr. TRIBBLE. I do not claim it, but I have not read a word but what is in the books and the record.

Mr. ANSBERRY. Have we not passed that item?

Mr. TRIBBLE. Yes, sir. We have passed that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Mary De Krieger, widow of Peter W. De Krieger, late of Company C, Tenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Now, Mr. Chairman, I call attention to a case on page 103 of the report, where a woman is to receive a pension from the committee, and I desire to call attention to the record in the office of the Pension Bureau. The applicant filed a claim under the act of June 27, 1890, on March 27, 1891, which was rejected July 24, 1899.

Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio. Has the gentleman reference to Charles Pettys?

Mr. TRIBBLE. No, sir; to Mary De Krieger.

On July 24, 1890, the case was reopened and rejected again, after special examination March 11, 1907, on the ground that the evidence failed to establish legal presumption of the soldier's death.

They took an appeal the last time. Upon appeal this rejection was affirmed July 13, 1907, and the department agreed with the basis of the rejection by the bureau.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the point I make is, this committee comes in here and sets up this precedent in this bill. It is not a new one, I admit, but I say it is contrary to the law of the United States.

I say that no woman can draw a pension under the statute laws of the United States, unless it affirmatively appears that her husband is dead and that he had pensionable rights. Now, this committee takes this case from the bureau when the bureau refused it, and with their power, with force at arms—the power that they have—they say to the bureau, “You are wrong, and we are going to give this woman a pension.” Upon what evidence? How many members of the committee have heard of this case? I would like to know how many members of the committee have read this case. What is the testimony that is furnished to the committee? The testimony furnished to the committee was the testimony of a gambler—a gambler who went by an alias. The gambler is said to have lived in one town, and a man by the name of Daly lived in another town, far removed, and the gambler got his information from Daly. According to the report of the Pension Bureau, Mr. Daly also bears an alias. Mr. Daly says that one man, by the name of Johnson, presumed by him to be the woman's husband, from information furnished him, is dead, and here is another alias, not the name of the woman's husband, but a man by the name of Johnson. And yet Darby tells the gambler that Johnson is dead. What reason has anybody to conclude that Johnson is De Krieger. In the name of God, do you propose to go on and pick out any kind of a name and any kind of proof and insert it here in order that somebody may get a pension?

Now, here is a statement to the effect that, owing to some defect in Cobb's statement, a man with an alias, taken after 30 years, the bureau had declined to take his uncorroborated statement. Now, Mr. Chairman, the bureau says:

One Charles Cobb, a gambler, informed one Patrick H. Daly, whom he met in Cheyenne (Daly being from Quincy), that soldier, whom he knew as Johnson, died in a prospecting tour in the fall of 1876 in Colorado, he, De Krieger, alias Daly, being one of a party of four, Cobb also being of the party. Owing to some discrepancies in Cobb's statements, taken 30 years after the reputed death, the bureau declined to accept his uncorroborated statement.

This committee does not furnish the House with the untruthful things Cobb furnished the bureau, referred to, but calls on this House to give her a pension with this kind of evidence, rejected by the bureau.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has no time to yield. His time has expired.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to disagree with my colleague from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE] with reference to this claim. I have looked over this case carefully, and I think this woman's husband is dead. In other words, I am sure he is dead, and the reason I am so certain that he is dead is because he has never made any application for a pension. [Applause and laughter.] If he enlisted, there is no question about the fact that he would already have applied for a pension. If he lived in the district of some one of my good friends over in Ohio or Illinois or Indiana, he certainly would have been on the pension roll. [Laughter.]

But this is rather a peculiar case. It seems from the evidence submitted to the committee that this man and his wife frequently fought; that upon several occasions from 1866 to 1870 they had numerous and sundry fist and cuff fights, and it must be apparent that the wife at length got the better of the old man in the melees along about in 1870, and he ran away, and because of that fact they have not heard of him, and because he ran off and never came back they assume that he is dead. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, seriously, it looks to me as though this case should have been more seriously investigated by the committee before they brought in their report.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. Yes.

Mr. TRIBBLE. My colleague has been solicitor general in Georgia, has he not?

Mr. HOWARD. Yes.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Did you ever draw a bill of indictment in behalf of a man who had an alias and believed him on oath?

Mr. HOWARD. I never did, and I never expect to. Now, it seems that somebody tried to boost up this old lady's claim. It developed that there were four gamblers, all hailing from that section of the country from which my distinguished colleague, Judge RUCKER, hails, and these gamblers, each with an alias, got together and submitted evidence to the Pension Bureau, and the Pension Bureau refused to believe their testimony and grant a pension to this woman. Now it appears from the state-

ment of my distinguished colleague [Mr. TRIBBLE] that they bring in a bill for a woman, whose husband has never been affirmatively proven to be dead.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. HOWARD. Yes.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Does not seven years' absence, without knowledge of the absentee being in life, establish in law death?

Mr. HOWARD. Ordinarily that is the rule, roughly stated.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Why would not that policy apply here, which would apply in a murder case or in any other case?

Mr. HOWARD. It would apply here if they had not fought between the years 1866 and 1870. It is not reasonable to suppose that a husband would write his wife an affectionate letter under those circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Hugh Lappin, late of Company I, Seventieth Regiment, and Company D, Seventy-third Regiment, New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. RODDENBERY. Mr. Chairman, in regard to this particular pension, I move to strike out the paragraph. It is on page 44, line 11, page 104, of the report; the second item.

This alleged soldier, who I doubt not was a soldier as the record shows, now 72 years old, drew a pension of \$6 a month for many years. Later, under existing law, he drew a pension of \$12 for several years, and still later, under another law, he drew a pension of \$15 a month for some time. Now, the committee recommends that his pension be increased to \$36 a month, which is more than doubling it at one stroke, while just above it, on the same page, is the case of a widow, 64 years old, who is dependent, who married the soldier just after the war. The soldier died, and now the committee recommends \$20 for the widow. I want to suggest to the gentleman that the difference between \$20 and \$36 shows a disproportionate amount that can not be defended. So I wish to suggest again to this committee that there are in this bill some items that should have been more carefully considered.

Mr. AKIN of New York. Is this going to be another case where the old lady put the dingbats on the old man?

Mr. RODDENBERY. It does not so appear. So far as I can see, the soldier is entitled to his pension and the widow is entitled to her pension, but it shows an inequality and excessive amounts, and I trust that the committee in future, in the exercise of their discretion, having many burdens to carry and many difficult problems to solve, will not treat lightly the attention that we have sought to call to these matters. We do not expect to have these items voted down. We well know they will pass the House, but it is in no improper spirit that the attention of the committee and the attention of the House is called to these excesses. Let us be more careful. Let us be no less just than the Republicans were, but more cautious than they were, more careful than they were. Not to save money at the expense of the soldiers of the country, but to save money from undeserving cases, so that we may well compensate the soldiers of the country and protect our taxpayers.

The Republicans have been reckless in expenditures, as we have charged for 15 years, and they have been reckless in granting pensions. The Republicans have manifested a recklessness that it is our Democratic duty to the country and to the soldiers to stop. It is our public duty as Democrats to deal justly with these soldiers, but to correct the errors into which the Republicans fell, and to avoid the recklessness in which they indulged, and let the country and the soldiers know that the Democrats, without regard to North, East, South, or West, will pension the deserving soldier, but will not recklessly and unguardedly let an excessive amount or an improper pension be appropriated from the Treasury of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RODDENBERY. I withdraw the pro forma amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Julia A. Rulo, widow of John Rulo, late of Company D, Thirtieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out “twenty” and insert “thirty,” in line 23, page 44.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana moves to strike out the word “twenty” and insert the word “thirty.”

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I renew my objection, and I renew the statement that I made previously that I have had assurance from members of this committee—

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I believe I have the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thought the gentleman did not desire to speak, and for that reason he recognized the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CLINE. I do not want to make any extended remarks or to cast any reflection upon the committee, because it would be a violation of their rule to change this rate.

I do want to call attention to this woman. They were married in 1856. He served nearly four years in the service, and died in 1910. They lived together about 60 years. She is totally blind, partially paralyzed, requires the care and assistance of another person all the time, and I think her pension ought to be increased to \$30.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I realize the fact that the House will pass the gentleman's amendment. I make my objection in the face of the fact that they will pass it. But, gentlemen, it sets a precedent; another man will come in here and repeat the same thing that we had on the floor previously and which started this fight on pensions. Now, the gentleman's amendment can go to the committee and the committee can bring it back in two weeks from now, and we can consider it. The chairman of the subcommittee assured me that hereafter the committee would not entertain amendments on the floor of the House; that they would insist on amendments increasing pensions going back to the committee and having a hearing on them before they would entertain them on the floor of the House.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I will have to say, in justice to the gentleman who has just spoken, that I did assure him that the committee would do all in its power to defeat all amendments except committee amendments. Now, in justice to the committee, I hope this amendment of the gentleman will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The question was considered, and the amendment was lost.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Della M. Williams, widow of David T. Williams, late of Company A, Seventy-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last paragraph read. Here is a widow, according to the report, that presents a case in which it is recommended that she be allowed \$20 a month. On the preceding page there was a soldier in the Army who is no more dependent, and the committee has just voted to give him a pension of \$40 a month. There is a manifest disparity in those cases. Soldiers all through this bill are given \$30 and \$36 and some \$40 a month. Right behind comes a widow who is only given \$12 or \$20 a month. Now, in the consideration of this measure there should be a just and sufficient reason given for discrimination and large amounts. Gentlemen here do not explain it.

The majority party in this House is charged, and our subcommittee is charged, with duty and public responsibility to deliberately and intelligently and justly consider these questions, and not grant a pension of \$40 to one valiant soldier, \$30 to another, and \$15 to one infirm widow, and \$30 to another. I submit to you, gentlemen, in all candor and all fairness, that we owe it to the country and to the soldiers and to the widows, in dealing with these things, to administer the pension laws justly. We ought to demonstrate what we claimed for 15 years, that we have more capacity for intelligent and fair and judicious legislation than our Republican friends. Are we pledged to imitate them? To be sure we have followed the distinguished ex-Speaker in one of our rules, but must we do it in our legislation? Can not we begin where they left off and where they recklessly expended money and dishonored the pension roll, can not we economize and clean it out and pay fair pensions to the real soldiers?

Let the people of this country understand that we are capable of doing justice to these old soldiers, and purge the roll of those who do not deserve it. It is our responsibility, it is our duty to the country, it is our duty to the soldiery, and our duty to ourselves.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the pro forma amendment of the gentleman from Georgia will be withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of James E. Greene, late of Company A, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to interpose except for a moment. The committee will notice that the last three pensions—James E. Green, \$30 a month; Louis H. Walker, \$24 a month; and George E. Wilson, \$36 a month—

three soldiers in consecutive order, with different pension allowances, all with service in the Army. Now, it is equity that I desire to impress upon the committee, and the responsibility and duty of the Democrats to investigate and to correct this discriminating practice. Do not let gentlemen get impatient and disturbed about the future of the party because of the disposition we have indicated here for discussion. My Democratic brethren, rather than make much of dangers here, should turn to Kentucky, to that brilliant Democratic editor, of 50 years' party allegiance, who lately continually dips his scathing pen in gall and excoriates the name and fame of the governor of one of our States—a Democrat, who aspires to the Presidency. If you want harmony do not turn here, but go to the great Democratic editor and bid him lay down his bitter pen and with Democratic loyalty pay high respect and tribute to another potential national Democrat. You Democratic leaders of this side, who have the power and who control the destiny of our party—have it in the palms of your hands—I bid you leaders counsel yourselves together with the other Democratic leaders who are now striking at the very heart of the great commoner and let them pour the oil of peace and not the vitriol of discord upon his head, for, although he may never wear the crown of gold upon his brow, we should not press down upon him the wreath of thorns. [Applause.] Therein lies party harmony and the people's triumph.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with amendments to the House, with a recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. FITZGERALD having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. DIXON of Indiana, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 21230, and had authorized him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RODDENBERRY) there were—ayes 80, noes 2.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, the question will be taken on ordering the previous question, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 170, noes 9, answered "present" 19, not voting 195, as follows:

YEAS—170.

Adair	Ellerbe	Kennedy	Rouse
Akin, N. Y.	Esch	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Rubey
Alexander	Falson	Kinkead, N. J.	Rucker, Colo.
Allen	Farr	Kitchin	Rucker, Mo.
Anderson, Minn.	Fergusson	Korby	Russell
Anderson, Ohio	Ferris	Lafferty	Scully
Ansberry	Fitzgerald	Lamb	Shackleford
Austin	Floyd, Ark.	Langham	Sharp
Barchfeld	Fordney	Lever	Sherwood
Barnhart	Fornes	Lewis	Simmons
Bathrick	Fowler	Lindbergh	Sisson
Berger	Francis	Littlepage	Sloan
Blackmon	French	Littleton	Smith, J. M. C.
Booher	Garner	Lloyd	Smith, Tex.
Bowman	Garrett	Lobeck	Stanley
Brown	Goldfogle	McCoy	Stedman
Bulkley	Good	McKinney	Steenerson
Burke, S. Dak.	Goodwin, Ark.	McLaughlin	Stephens, Cal.
Burke, Wis.	Gray	McMorran	Sterling
Burnett	Greene, Mass.	Maguire, Nebr.	Stone
Byrns, Tenn.	Gregg, Pa.	Mann	Sulloway
Campbell	Hamilton, W. Va.	Mays	Switzer
Cannon	Hamilin	Moore, Pa.	Talcott, N. Y.
Clark, Fla.	Hardwick	Morgan	Taylor, Colo.
Claypool	Hartman	Morrison	Thistlewood
Cline	Haugen	Moss, Ind.	Thomas
Cooper	Hawley	Murdock	Tilson
Crago	Hay	Murray	Tuttle
Crumpacker	Hayden	Neeley	Underwood
Cullop	Heald	Nelson	Utter
Dalzell	Helm	Norris	Volstead
Daugherty	Hensley	Nye	Vreeland
Davidson	Higgins	Padgett	Watkins
Davis, Minn.	Hill	Pickett	Wedemeyer
Davis, W. Va.	Holland	Porter	Whitacre
Denver	Howell	Post	White
Dickinson	Hughes, N. J.	Powers	Wickliffe
Dixon, Ind.	Hull	Pray	Willis
Dodds	Humphreys, Miss.	Rainey	Wilson, Pa.
Doughton	Jackson	Raker	Wood, N. J.
Driscoll, D. A.	Jacoway	Rauch	Young, Kans.
Dwight	James	Rees	
Dyer	Kendall	Roberts, Nev.	

NAYS—9.

Byrnes, S. C.	Harrison, Miss.	Roddenberry	Tribble
Callaway	Howard	Stephens, Miss.	Witherspoon
Edwards			

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—19.

Adamson	Fairchild	Hamilton, Mich.	Parran
Bell, Ga.	Focht	Houston	Ransdell, La.
Candler	Foster, Ill.	Lee, Ga.	Sparkman
Dupre	Gallagher	McGillicuddy	Woods, Iowa
Estopinal	Gould	Page	

NOT VOTING—195.

Alken, S. C.	Doremus	Konop	Prouty
Ainey	Draper	Kopp	Pujo
Ames	Driscoll, M. E.	Lafean	Randell, Tex.
Andrus	Evans	La Follette	Redfield
Anthony	Fields	Langley	Reilly
Ashbrook	Finley	Lawrence	Reyburn
Ayres	Flood, Va.	Lee, Pa.	Richardson
Bartholdt	Foss	Legare	Riordan
Bartlett	Foster, Vt.	Lenroot	Roberts, Mass.
Bates	Fuller	Levy	Robinson
Beall, Tex.	Gardner, Mass.	Lindsay	Rodenberg
Bingham	Gardner, N. J.	Linthicum	Rothermel
Boehne	George	Longworth	Sabath
Borland	Gillett	Loud	Saunders
Bradley	Glass	McCall	Sells
Brantley	Godwin, N. C.	McCreary	Sheppard
Broussard	Goeke	McDermott	Sherley
Browning	Graham	McGuire, Okla.	Sims
Buchanan	Green, Iowa	McHenry	Slayden
Burgess	Gregg, Tex.	McKellar	Slemp
Burke, Pa.	Griest	McKenzie	Small
Burleson	Gudger	McKinley	Smith, Saml. W.
Butler	Guernsey	Macon	Smith, Cal.
Calder	Hamill	Madden	Smith, N. Y.
Cantrill	Hammond	Maher	Speer
Carlin	Hanna	Malby	Stack
Carter	Hardy	Martin, Colo.	Stephens, Nebr.
Cary	Harris	Martin, S. Dak.	Stephens, Tex.
Catlin	Harrison, N. Y.	Matthews	Stevens, Minn.
Clayton	Hayes	Miller	Sulzer
Collier	Hefflin	Mondell	Sweet
Connell	Helgesen	Moon, Pa.	Taggart
Conry	Henry, Conn.	Moon, Tenn.	Talbott, Md.
Copley	Henry, Tex.	Moore, Tex.	Taylor, Ala.
Covington	Hinds	Morse, Wis.	Taylor, Ohio
Cox, Ind.	Hobson	Mott	Thayer
Cox, Ohio	Howland	Needham	Towner
Cravens	Hubbard	Oldfield	Townsend
Curley	Hughes, Ga.	Olmsted	Turnbull
Currier	Hughes, W. Va.	O'Shaunessy	Underhill
Curry	Humphrey, Wash.	Palmer	Warburton
Danforth	Johnson, Ky.	Patten, N. Y.	Webb
Davenport	Johnson, S. C.	Patton, Pa.	Weeks
De Forest	Jones	Payne	Wilder
Dent	Kahn	Pepper	Wilson, Ill.
Dickson, Miss.	Kent	Peters	Wilson, N. Y.
Dies	Kindred	Plumley	Young, Mich.
Difenderfer	Knowland	Pou	Young, Tex.
Donohoe	Konig	Prince	

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. GALLAGHER with Mr. FULLER.
 Mr. SHERLEY with Mr. GILLETT.
 Mr. OLDFIELD with Mr. BINGHAM.
 Mr. SHEPPARD with Mr. BATES.
 Mr. HOBSON with Mr. FAIRCHILD.
 Mr. FIELDS with Mr. LANGLEY.
 Mr. MACON with Mr. SMITH of California.
 Mr. GOULD with Mr. HINDS.
 Mr. RICHARDSON with Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota.
 Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. PARRAN.
 Mr. FOSTER of Illinois with Mr. KOPP.
 Mr. McDERMOTT with Mr. FOSS.
 Mr. HUGHES of Georgia with Mr. DRAPER.
 Mr. AIKEN of South Carolina with Mr. AINEY.
 Mr. AYRES with Mr. AMES.
 Mr. BEALL of Texas with Mr. ANTHONY.
 Mr. BORLAND with Mr. BARTHOLDT.
 Mr. ASHBROOK with Mr. BROWNING.
 Mr. BRANTLEY with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. BURGESS with Mr. CARY.
 Mr. BURLESON with Mr. CATLIN.
 Mr. CANTRILL with Mr. COPELY.
 Mr. CARTER with Mr. CURRIER.
 Mr. CLAYTON with Mr. CURRY.
 Mr. CONNELL with Mr. DANFORTH.
 Mr. CONRY with Mr. DE FOREST.
 Mr. COVINGTON with Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL.
 Mr. COX of Indiana with Mr. FOSTER of Vermont.
 Mr. COX of Ohio with Mr. FULLER.
 Mr. CURLEY with Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey.
 Mr. DAVENPORT with Mr. GREEN of Iowa.
 Mr. DENT with Mr. GRIEST.
 Mr. DICKSON of Mississippi with Mr. GUERNSEY.
 Mr. DONOHOE with Mr. HANNA.
 Mr. DOREMUS with Mr. HARRIS.
 Mr. FINLEY with Mr. HAYES.
 Mr. PALMER with Mr. CALDER.

Mr. BUCHANAN with Mr. LAFEAN.
 Mr. DIES with Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma.
 Mr. FLOOD of Virginia with Mr. HELGESEN.
 Mr. GEORGE with Mr. HOWLAND.
 Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina with Mr. HUBBARD.
 Mr. GOEKE with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.
 Mr. GRAHAM with Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington.
 Mr. GREGG of Texas with Mr. NEEDHAM.
 Mr. GUDGER with Mr. KNOWLAND.
 Mr. HARDY with Mr. LA FOLLETTE.
 Mr. HEFLIN with Mr. LAWRENCE.
 Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky with Mr. LONGWORTH.
 Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama with Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio.
 Mr. TOWNSEND with Mr. TOWNER.
 Mr. TURNBULL with Mr. WARBURTON.
 Mr. UNDERHILL with Mr. WEEKS.
 Mr. TAGGART with Mr. YOUNG of Michigan.
 Mr. YOUNG of Texas with Mr. WILSON of Illinois.
 Mr. WILSON of New York with Mr. WILDER.
 Mr. HENRY of Texas with Mr. LENROOT.
 Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina with Mr. LOUD.
 Mr. JONES with Mr. McCALL.
 Mr. KINDRED with Mr. McCREARY.
 Mr. KONIG with Mr. McKENZIE.
 Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania with Mr. McKINLEY.
 Mr. LEGARE with Mr. MADDEN.
 Mr. LEVY with Mr. MATTHEWS.
 Mr. MOON of Tennessee with Mr. MILLER.
 Mr. MOORE of Texas with Mr. MORSE of Wisconsin.
 Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. MOTT.
 Mr. POU with Mr. KENT.
 Mr. RANDELL of Texas with Mr. PATTON of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. REDFIELD with Mr. PAYNE.
 Mr. SAUNDERS with Mr. PLUMLEY.
 Mr. SIMS with Mr. PRINCE.
 Mr. SLAYDEN with Mr. REYBURN.
 Mr. STACK with Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts.
 Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska with Mr. RODENBERG.
 Mr. STEPHENS of Texas with Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan.
 Mr. SULZER with Mr. Samuel W. SMITH.
 Mr. SWEET with Mr. SPEER.
 For the session:

Mr. BARTLETT with Mr. BUTLER.

Mr. GLASS with Mr. SLEMP.

Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. ANDRUS.

Mr. PUJO with Mr. McMORRAN.

Mr. ADAMSON with Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota.

Mr. COLLIER with Mr. WOODS of Iowa.

Mr. FORTNES with Mr. BRADLEY.

For balance of day:

Mr. HOUSTON with Mr. KAHN.

Until March 11:

Mr. WEBB with Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. DIFENDERFER with Mr. FOCHT.

Mr. DAVIS with Mr. PROUTY.

Until March 13:

Mr. HARRISON of New York with Mr. OLMSTED.

Until March 20:

Mr. PATTEN of New York with Mr. MALBY.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. KOPP, did not vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. He is not recorded as voting. Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. I voted "aye." I would like to withdraw my vote.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I desire to inquire if the gentleman from Texas, Mr. STEPHENS, voted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. He is not recorded as voting.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I am paired with the gentleman from Texas and I desire to withdraw my vote of "aye" and answer "present."

Prior to the announcement the following took place,

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Is the Chair prepared to announce the result?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is waiting until the Sergeant at Arms under the rule brings in absentees sufficient to make a quorum.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I understand, then, that a quorum is not present. I had heard no announcement of the result of the roll call.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No announcement has been made and none will be made at present, or until the Sergeant at Arms executes his orders.

Mr. MANN. The Chair directed the Sergeant at Arms to notify absent Members, and we are simply waiting for them. That is all we can do.

Subsequently,

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. I submit that under the rules of the House, when a call is made and a quorum does not appear, and the Speaker in the exercise of his rights directs the Sergeant at Arms to produce the Members at the bar, the Sergeant at Arms is required to detain those who are present and bring in the absentees. I make the point of order that Members are going out as fast as they come in.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that so far as the Chair is informed the Sergeant at Arms is performing his duty.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. So far as the Chair observes?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. So far as the Chair is informed. Subsequently,

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Is it in order for me to submit a few remarks?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thinks not.

Subsequently,

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. While the Chair is waiting to obtain the presence of a quorum, would it not be in order, by unanimous consent to have some Members who introduced these bills explain the merits of their bills that they have not had time to explain as yet?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is not a parliamentary inquiry, and it would not be in order in the absence of a quorum.

Subsequently,

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RODDENBERRY] be allowed to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It would not be in order. There is no business before the House.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I assume it would not be business. It would be simply a speech.

Subsequently,

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Merely to observe, Mr. Speaker, that—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is not in order to make observations. The gentleman will be in order.

Subsequently,

Mr. RODDENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Chair if it may not be possible for us to obtain a quorum, so as to dispose of this matter before adjournment, in order that we may take up the Agriculture appropriation bill promptly in the morning and proceed with it?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UNDERWOOD). The Chair will state to the gentleman from Georgia that the House, according to the parliamentary rules of the House, is endeavoring to obtain a quorum, and the Sergeant at Arms is notifying absentees to appear before the bar of the House.

Mr. RODDENBERRY. I certainly hope the Sergeant at Arms will succeed, so that we can reach the consideration of the Agriculture appropriation bill.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A quorum is present. The motion is agreed to, and a quorum being present, the Doorkeeper will open the doors, and further proceedings under the call will be dispensed with.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, the following concurrent resolution was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

Senate concurrent resolution 18.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be requested to make a supplemental or additional report or estimate concerning the work of levee construction in the improvement of the navigability of the Mississippi River on the east bank thereof from Vicksburg to Bayou Sara for use in connection with S. 4353, being a bill to aid in construction of levees and embankments on the east side of the Mississippi River.

—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 4151. An act to authorize the Minnesota & International Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Bemidji, in the State of Minnesota.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, March 9, 1912, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, recommending certain changes in his estimate of appropriation for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, under head of "Distinctive paper for United States securities" and "Expenses of national currency" (H. Doc. No. 603); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Interior submitting estimate of appropriation for installation and purchase of power press for the reproduction of United States maps, etc., issued by the General Land Office (H. Doc. No. 602); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. SIMMONS, from the Committee on Agriculture, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21291) to regulate the importation of nursery stock and other plants and plant products, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain quarantine districts for plant diseases and insect pests, to permit and regulate the movement of fruits, plants, and vegetables therefrom, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 398), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 263) to authorize allotments to Indians of the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation, N. Dak., of lands valuable for coal, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 399), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 19776) for the relief of the heirs of Bluford West, deceased, and the same was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 21531) making an appropriation for the deepening of the channels of the East River, in the harbor of New York; for the improving and deepening of the approaches to the wharves of said river on both sides thereof; for the improving and deepening of the channels known as Little Hell Gate and the Harlem Kills; to reduce the velocity of the tides in the East River and its connecting channels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 21532) to incorporate the Rockefeller Foundation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 21533) amending section 2 of an act entitled "An act to increase the pension of widows, minor children, etc., of deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War, the War with Mexico, the various Indian wars, etc., and to grant a pension to certain widows of the deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War," approved April 19, 1908; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THISTLEWOOD: A bill (H. R. 21534) making appropriation for the improvement of the Government roadway leading from Mounds, Mound City, and from the Cache River Bridge to the national cemetery near Mound City, Ill.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 21535) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to secure for the United States title to patented lands in the Yosemite National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 21536) providing for extension of time in which to make water-right payments on account of inability, caused by loss of crops or other misfortune, to make payment at maturity; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. BELL of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 21537) to provide for the erection of a public building at the city of Toccoa, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21538) to provide for the erection of a public building at the city of Jefferson, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21539) to provide for the erection of a public building at the city of Commerce, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21540) to provide for the erection of a public building at the city of Canton, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21541) to provide for the erection of a public building at the city of Buford, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21542) to provide for the erection of a public building at the city of Lawrenceville, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21543) to provide for the erection of a public building at the city of Winder, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 21544) to provide for the physical valuation of properties of carriers subject to the act to regulate commerce and to secure information concerning their stocks and bonds and boards of directors; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 21545) to credit and pay to the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia all moneys collected under the direct tax levied by the acts of Congress approved, respectively, July 1, 1862; March 7, 1864; July 13, 1866; and March 2, 1867; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Resolution (H. Res. 444) to change the rules of the House temporarily for the consideration of H. R. 21279; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. NYE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 265) making public acknowledgment of the services of Capt. John Ericsson; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 43) to provide for printing Public Health Bulletin No. 51; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 21546) granting a pension to James W. McLaughlin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 21547) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Butler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 21548) for the relief of E. L. George; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: A bill (H. R. 21549) granting a pension to Anne L. Holbrook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BELL of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 21550) granting a pension to Robert Wilson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21551) granting a pension to Edward Robertson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DOREMUS: A bill (H. R. 21552) granting a pension to Nettie Weidenbein; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DANIEL A. DRISCOLL: A bill (H. R. 21553) granting a pension to Caroline Reichold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 21554) for the relief of the estate of William F. Graham; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FRANCIS: A bill (H. R. 21555) granting an increase of pension to Oliver Harding; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREGG of Texas: A bill (H. R. 21556) for the relief of Theresa S. Randolph, heir of Meredith P. Tanner, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAMELIN: A bill (H. R. 21557) for the relief of John Beverly; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAMMOND: A bill (H. R. 21558) granting an increase of pension to William Frisbie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 21559) to correct the relative and lineal rank of an officer of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 21560) granting an increase of pension to Harlow Reilley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21561) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin P. Simpson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21562) granting an increase of pension to James A. Dowell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 21563) granting an increase of pension to John W. Vandergriff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 21564) for the relief of the heirs of Lewis Boatner, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 21565) granting an increase of pension to Ezekiel Bogard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KONOP: A bill (H. R. 21566) granting a pension to Michael Kennedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21567) granting a pension to William J. D. Pope; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21568) granting an increase of pension to James Meikle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MACON: A bill (H. R. 21569) granting an increase of pension to Susan C. Virgin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCREARY: A bill (H. R. 21570) granting a pension to Edwin M. Deemer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21571) granting an honorable discharge to John O. Long; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21572) granting an honorable discharge to Emanuel Damsohn; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21573) granting a pension to Susannah M. Geiss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKINNEY: A bill (H. R. 21574) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Rusk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McMORRAN: A bill (H. R. 21575) granting an increase of pension to Nicholas La Croix; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NYE: A bill (H. R. 21576) to correct the military record of Thomas N. Jimerson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PATTON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 21577) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Holter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAUCH: A bill (H. R. 21578) granting an increase of pension to William F. M. Balsley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIORDAN: A bill (H. R. 21579) granting a pension to Herman E. Jansen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SCULLY: A bill (H. R. 21580) granting an increase of pension to Francesca Perrine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 21581) granting an increase of pension to Egbert F. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (by request): A bill (H. R. 21582) for the relief of the estate of S. H. Carter; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THAYER: A bill (H. R. 21583) granting an increase of pension to Julia J. Kendall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 21584) granting an increase of pension to Ezra Salter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 21585) granting an increase of pension to Fred Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Women's Protective Local Union, of Cabo Rojo, P. R., urging that residents of that island be granted American citizenship; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Petition of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, of Pattonsburg, Mo., for passage of Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Petition of John McConnell and others, of Henry County, Ohio, for parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petition of Bricklayers' Union, No. 2, of Pittsburgh, Pa., for a thorough investigation of the affair at Lawrence, Mass., and the causes thereof; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce, of Pittsburgh, Pa., indorsing the Sulzer bill to insure accuracy in weights and grade of original packages; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting a pension to Annie L. Holbrook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWMAN: Petition of Parmelia Constine, secretary of the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., opposing the Dillingham immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of C. I. Frayler, favoring a parcel post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of citizens of Hazleton, Pa., asking that Lawrence, Mass., strike be investigated; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of Dr. J. W. Williams, of Baltimore, Md., favoring continuation of appropriation to Columbia Hospital for Women; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Equal Rights Association of Kentucky, favoring woman's suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Active Workers' Association of Luzerne County, Pa., favoring the illiteracy test for admission of immigrants; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BROWNING: Petition of the Memorial Presbyterian Church of Wenonah, N. J., for passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BULKLEY: Petition of 41 citizens of Cleveland, urging that a provision be incorporated in the naval appropriation bill for the construction of one battleship in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: Petition of citizens of Coffeyville, Kans., for passage of House bill 16450; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANDLER: Petitions of Masonic Lodge of Corinth, the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions of Saltillo and Tupelo, and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union State officers of Mississippi, for enactment of Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CATLIN: Petition of the German Alliance of Missouri, protesting against interstate liquor legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Polish National Alliance, protesting against immigration restriction laws; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Northwest Missouri Press Association, opposing an increase in second-class postal rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Hilmer Commission Co., of St. Louis, favoring amending the oleomargarine law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLINE: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Fort Wayne and the Presbyterian Church of Ray, Ind., for an effective interstate liquor law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 37, International Union of Steam Engineers, for construction of one battleship in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petitions of citizens of the State of Indiana, protesting against parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petitions of the Methodist Episcopal Church and citizens of Wilmington, Pa., for enactment of Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DICKINSON: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Claudius L. Pyle (H. R. 2077); to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOREMUS: Petition of Campbell Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church, of Detroit, Mich., for passage of Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIEL A. DRISCOLL: Memorial of the Carriage, Wagon, and Automobile Workers' International Union of North America, relative to strike at Lawrence, Mass.; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petitions of Catholic societies of Buffalo and Gardenville, N. Y., in regard to measures relating to Catholic Indian mission interests; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL: Petition of the Methodist Church of Minoa, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate-commerce liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of voters of Manlius, N. Y., favoring adoption of House joint resolution 168; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of citizens of Neillsville, Wis., protesting against Lever agricultural bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of citizens of Monroe County, Wis., for parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FERGUSON: Petitions of citizens of the State of New Mexico, for changes in the public-land laws; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of New Mexico Christian Endeavor Union, in favor of House bill 9433; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FORNES: Petition of United States Civil Service Retirement Association, for enactment of the Hamill bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of Union No. 23, International Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union of North America, for increased compensation to pressmen and assistants in the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Printing.

Also, petition of Municipal Council, United Spanish War Veterans, New York City, for enactment of House bill 17470; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petitions of Simpson-Crawford Co., and Louis M. Hart, of New York City, protesting against House bill 16844; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Fancy Leather Goods Manufacturers' Association of New York, for enactment of House bill 5601; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOSS: Petitions of citizens of the State of Illinois, for enactment of Berger old-age pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Deutsche Krieger Verein of Peru, Ill., against the passage of any legislation now pending concerning interstate-commerce shipments of intoxicating liquor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Royal Mantel & Furniture Co., of Rockford, Ill., opposed to the passage of the Underwood bill (H. R. 20182), concerning the proposed duty on China wood oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of G. H. Gurler, of De Kalb, Ill., in opposition to the passage of the Lever bill, so far as it concerns the dairy interests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Daniel Thiel, of Pecatonica, Ill., in opposition to the proposed extension of the parcel-post service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Waldron Murphy Camp, No. 29, United Spanish War Veterans, of Chicago, Ill., favoring the passage of the Crago bill (H. R. 17470), to pension widows of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of La Salle County, Ill., for the creation of a department of health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOEKE: Petition of 36 citizens of Lima, Ohio, asking that one battleship be built in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of Post No. 411, Grand Army of the Republic, protesting against incorporating the Grand Army of the Republic; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of National Anti-Injunction League, for enactment of House bill 11032; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREGG of Pennsylvania: Petitions of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Alverton, First Baptist Church of Mount Pleasant, and Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Butler County, Pa., for enactment of Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of citizens of Latrobe and Newton, Pa., asking that the duties on raw and refined sugars be reduced; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Retail Merchants and Business Men's Association of southwestern Pennsylvania, for ratification of arbitration treaties, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Butler County (Pa.) Business Men's Association, in favor of 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GREGG of Texas: Petition of citizens of Galveston, Tex., protesting against parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: Petition of citizens of Paw Paw, Mich., protesting against House bill 9433; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Paw Paw, Mich., protesting against enactment of Senate bill 237; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petitions of Grange No. 178, of St. Joseph County, and citizens of Hartford, Mich., for parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Saugatuck, Mich., in opposition to parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of citizens of the State of Michigan, for passage of Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMLIN: Petition of numerous citizens of Springfield, Mo., favoring old-age pensions; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of New Britain, and citizens of Bristol, Conn., protesting against repeal of anticanteen law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HINDS: Memorial of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of North Berwick, Me., for legislation restricting the interstate traffic in intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Socialists of Portland, Me., relative to the strike at Lawrence, Mass.; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOUSTON: Papers to accompany House bill 19749; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of Bedford County, Tenn., for enactment of an effective interstate liquor law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey: Petition of citizens of Paterson, N. J., for construction of one battleship in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: Petition of citizens of Valentine and Arabia, Nebr., urging the passage of the Sulzer parcel-post bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Elm Creek, Nebr., and of Lexington, Nebr., urging the passage of House bill 16689, validating sales of part of the right of way of the Union Pacific Railroad; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of citizens of Garfield County, Nebr., requesting the passage of a bill granting pensions to soldiers, sailors, and marines confined in Confederate prisons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Christian Church of the village of Gering, Nebr., urging the passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard bill to withdraw from interstate commerce protection liquors imported into "dry" territory for illegal use; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Pennsylvania, urging the construction of one battleship in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of E. J. Babcock, of University of North Dakota, for enactment of House bill 6304; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, petition of Charles H. Levermore, of Adelphi College, Brooklyn, N. Y., for enactment of Senate bill 3; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Municipal Council, United Spanish War Veterans, New York City, for enactment of House bill 17470; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LLOYD: Petition of citizens of Mississippi, protesting against parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Nebraska, protesting against parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of John La Londe and 18 other residents of Black River, Mich., protesting against parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. McKINNEY: Petition of the Concordia Germania Turnverein, of Moline, Ill., in opposition to prohibition or amendment of interstate liquor laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Scandinavian Temperance Union, of Moline, Ill., in favor of the passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard bill for the regulation of interstate transportation of intoxicating liquor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MALBY: Petition of citizens of Talleville, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Postal Progress League parcel-post bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of Union Church, Parishville, N. Y.; Christian Endeavor Society, Champlain, N. Y.; and Woman's Christian Temperance Unions of Malone and Champlain, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard bill to withdraw from interstate commerce protection liquors imported into dry territory for illegal use; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of Fort Covington Grange, Fort Covington, N. Y., and Schuyler Falls Grange, Schuyler Falls, N. Y., protesting against the repeal of the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: Petition of citizens of Big Stone City, S. Dak., in opposition to Lever bill and in favor of Haugen bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Hayes Brummett (H. R. 21151); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Texas: Petition of druggists of Houston, Tex., protesting against certain legislation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORGAN: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions, churches, etc., in the State of Oklahoma, for enactment of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of citizens of the second congressional district of Oklahoma, for parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Cherokee, Okla., protesting against parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of Central Federated Union of New York, for construction of at least one battleship in the Brooklyn Navy Yard, etc.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Jefferson County (N. Y.) Grange, protesting against repeal of tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions of Granges Nos. 60, 535, 599, 684, and 721, in New York State, protesting against the Lever bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURRAY: Petitions of numerous citizens of Boston, Mass., and vicinity, urging the construction of one battleship in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RAINEY: Petition of Warner Randolph Dry Goods Co. and sundry other merchants and business men of White Hall, Ill., protesting against the parcel-post bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Will G. Loomans and sundry other citizens of Meredosia, Ill., protesting against a parcel post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Ellen L. Rupert, president of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, and 18 others of Rockport, Ill., favoring the speedy passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill (S. 4043, H. R. 16214); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Robert S. Raap, Patrick J. S. Kerrett, Joseph G. Kirwan, John T. McCormick, John J. McGillen, James Carey, James Kelly, committee of Waldron Murphy Camp, No. 29, United Spanish War Veterans, favoring House bill 17470, the Crago pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of 18 citizens of Morgan County, Ill., protesting against the passage of the Lever bill and favoring the Haugen bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAKER: Memorial of Steam Schooner Association of San Francisco, favoring Revenue-Cutter Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Los Angeles (Cal.) Chamber of Commerce, protesting against any reduction in the tariff on olive oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REDFIELD: Memorial of American Flint Glass Workers' Union No. 68, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the Berger resolution providing for an investigation of strike conditions at Lawrence, Mass.; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REILLY: Petitions of Connecticut Hardware Association, Iowa Retail Hardware Association, and Duquoin (Ill.) Retail Merchants' Association, for 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petitions of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Asbury Park, the Methodist Episcopal and Presbyterian Churches of Barnegat, and the Presbyterian Church of Perth Amboy, all in the State of New Jersey, for passage of

Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMMONS: Petition of the Citizens' Temperance League of Kendall, N. Y., for passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard interstate liquor bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petition of the Whittier Quarterly Meeting of the Friends' Church and the Men's League of the Friends' Church of Whittier, Cal.; from the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Covina, Cal.; and from numerous citizens of Pasadena, Cal., for the passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard bill to withdraw from interstate-commerce protection liquors imported into "dry" territory for illegal use; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STERLING: Petitions of citizens of Dwight and Lincoln, Ill., protesting against parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of citizens of New York City, for enactment of House bill 17253; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the United States Civil Service Retirement Association, for enactment of Hamill bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of Playground and Recreation Association of America, for enactment of House bill 17681; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Buffalo (N. Y.) Cooperative Store Co., for 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Municipal Council, United Spanish War Veterans, New York City, for enactment of House bill 17470; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Simpson-Crawford Co., of New York City, protesting against passage of House bill 16844; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of J. Whitridge Williams, of Baltimore, Md., for an appropriation for Columbia Hospital for Women; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of E. J. Babcock, of University of North Dakota, for enactment of House bill 6304; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, memorial of National Injunction League, indorsing House bill 11032; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWNER: Petition of Commercial Club of Clarinda, Iowa, protesting against the proposed parcel post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Sharpsburg, Shambaugh, and Braddyville, Iowa, against parcel post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petitions of numerous citizens of New York, urging the construction of one battleship in a Government navy yard; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of numerous citizens of Dundee, N. Y., protesting against parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. VREELAND: Petition of Friendship Seventh-Day Baptist Church, Friendship, Allegany County, N. Y., for passage of Kenyon-Sheppard bill, to withdraw from interstate-commerce protection liquors imported into "dry" territory for illegal use; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Nile, N. Y., for passage of Kenyon-Sheppard bill, to withdraw from interstate-commerce protection liquors imported into "dry" territory for illegal use; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE: Petition of citizens of Cambridge, Ohio, protesting against parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: Petitions of Young People's Branch of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of South Bound Brook, N. J.; the Baptist Church, of Flemington, N. J.; Mount Carmel Baptist Church, of Lambertville, N. J.; Reformed Church, of Peapack, N. J.; and Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Trenton, for the passage of the Kenyon-Sheppard bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Locktown Grange, No. 88, Patrons of Husbandry, of Locktown, N. J., asking for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of Kansas: Petition of citizens of Cawker City, Kans., protesting against parcel-post legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Cawker City, Kans., for regulation of express rates and classifications; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, March 9, 1912.

The Senate met at 2 o'clock p. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

MINIDOKA RECLAMATION PROJECT IN IDAHO (S. DOC. NO. 384).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 26th ultimo, certain information relative to water users on the Minidoka reclamation project in the State of Idaho, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands and ordered to be printed.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the findings of fact and conclusions of law filed by the court in the following causes:

Mary E. Broders, widow of Henry B. Broders, deceased, v. United States (S. Doc. No. 385);

Walter H. Coon v. United States (S. Doc. No. 386);

W. R. Milward, administrator of Charles Milward, deceased, v. United States (S. Doc. No. 387);

Robert W. Pool v. United States (S. Doc. No. 388);

Robert A. Ragan v. United States (S. Doc. No. 389);

Alice Reade, widow of John Reade, deceased, v. United States (S. Doc. No. 390);

Rachel M. Reubelt, widow of John A. Reubelt, deceased, v. United States (S. Doc. No. 391);

Harriet B. Riley, widow of William E. Riley, deceased, v. United States (S. Doc. No. 392);

Adam Schuh v. United States (S. Doc. No. 393);

Samuel C. Scott v. United States (S. Doc. No. 394);

Henry A. Smith v. United States (S. Doc. No. 395);

James P. Taber v. United States (S. Doc. No. 396);

Andrew J. Thomas v. United States (S. Doc. No. 397);

Fred von Baumbach v. United States (S. Doc. No. 398);

William E. Woodruff v. United States (S. Doc. No. 399); and Jacques Kalt v. United States (S. Doc. No. 400).

The foregoing findings were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 21230) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (S. 4238) to provide for the use of the American National Red Cross in aid of the land and naval forces in time of actual or threatened war.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 19238) to amend section 90 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (S. 4151) to authorize the Minnesota & International Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Bemidji, in the State of Minnesota, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented petitions of the King's Daughters Circle of Clarkesburg, Va., of the congregation of the Christian Church of Ensley, Ala., and of the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions of Middlesex County, Mass.; Van Meter, Iowa; Palmyra, Wis.; Granville, Ill.; and of Kansas City, Kans., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and importation of intoxicating liquors, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Russian River Chamber of Commerce, of California, praying that an appropriation be made for the improvement of the Yosemite National Park, which were referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. BURTON. I present two memorials protesting against the reduction of the tariff on watches and watch movements